

at midnight, and this perhaps may give us some idea of the distance of the two places.

I do not think that I need add anything to these remarks except that I had omitted to mention that Fernandez visited Ciandecan in October, 1599, and got letters patent from the king. As an additional precaution, Fernandez obtained permission from the king to have these letters also signed by the king's son, who was then a boy of twelve years of age. The boy may have been Udayaditya, and so he must have been only three or four years older than Rámchandra Rái of Bakla.

I must not omit to point out that the fact that Vikramáditya chose Jessore as a safe retreat as the strongest possible evidence of the jungly nature of the surrounding country. It is true it had been cultivated in the previous century by Khánja 'Alí, but the experiment had proved a failure, and the land had in the time of his successor (?) Chánd Khán relapsed into jungle.

To sum up, it seems to me that the Sundarbans have never been in a more flourishing condition than they are in at present. I believe that large parts of Bákirganj and Jessore were at one time cultivated, that they relapsed into jungle, and that they have soon been cleared again, and I have also no doubt that the courts of the kings of Bakla and of Ciandecan imparted some degree of splendour to the surrounding country. But I do not believe that the gloomy Sundarbans on the surface of Jessore and Bákirganj were ever well peopled or the sites of cities.

On Human Sacrifices in Ancient India.—By RÁJENDRALÁLA MITRA, LL. D.

Nothing can be more abhorrent to modern civilization than the idea of slaughtering human victims for the propitiation of the great Father of the universe; yet, looking to the character of the different systems of religion which governed the conscience of man in primitive times, it would by no means be unreasonable to assume *à priori* that such an idea should have been pretty common, if not universal.

The tendency to assign human attributes to the Divinity was a marked peculiarity in almost all systems of religion that then got into currency. The ideal of God was derived from the concrete man. The attributes were doubtless magnified manifold, but their character remained the same—they differed only in degree, but not in kind. A being of unlimited power, of profound erudition, of great subtlety, was what the untutored finite mind of man could conceive in its aspirations to grasp the infinite; and as those aspi-

rations were inspired by a dread of some, to it, unknown force which brings on misfortune, the human susceptibilities of being vexed at disobedience and appeased by flattery and peace-offering, were early attributed to him. In fact a cruel, fierce, vindictive being, whose grace could be purchased by coaxing and presents, was one of the earliest conceptions of the Godhead among primitive races. With the advancement of civilization this conception was materially and greatly purified and improved, but the idea of winning the good-will of an offended, or indifferently disposed, being of great power could not be shaken off, and the coaxing and the presents had, therefore, to be retained under some shape or other. All mantras, charms, and prayers—all offerings, oblations and sacrifices—in fact, the whole history of religion, may be looked upon as the gradual development of this cardinal idea. And inasmuch as the efficacy of an offering, in the case of man, is dependant upon its nearness of relation and preciousness to the offerer, and in primitive times the prime of the flock was the most valued article of possession, sacrifices of animals naturally obtained the highest place in the cultus of ancient worshippers. The owner of the flock was, of course, the nearest and most precious to himself, and his children, the next after him, and accordingly they would be deemed the most appropriate to be offered as sacrifices; though, generally speaking, the main object of worship, in early times, having been the temporal good of the worshipper, it was by no means convenient for him to offer himself as a sacrifice for it. Children, particularly when there happened to be several in a family, could be more readily spared, and they would accordingly be more frequently given up for the purpose.

Again, working out, with reference to the Divinity, the human practice of professing submission by putting oneself into privations and degradation in the presence of the person whose good-will has to be secured, penance and mortification early formed a part of religion, and indeed have been co-extensive with religion itself; and the conclusion was soon arrived at, that if the mortification of the flesh was gratifying to the Divinity, its entire dedication to Him would be much more so. But self-love here intervened, and suggested the idea of substitutes or vicarious sacrifice, which has exercised so potent an influence in the evolution of the religious cultus everywhere.

Further, rejoicings after success in warfare formed a most important element in the annals of primitive society, and as such successes were universally acknowledged to be due to divine interference, the idea of offering to the intervener the fruits thereof was but natural, and the offering of prisoners-of-war as sacrifices was the obvious conclusion arrived at. The extreme difficulty of keeping in security and feeding large bodies of prisoners-of-war has often suggested the necessity of summarily disposing of them by slaughter,—even Napoleon I., it is said, once felt compelled to resort to the odious method of poisoning some of his sick comrades whom he could

not carry away in his march from Jaffa,*—and in ancient times, with no secure prisons and defective commissariat arrangements, when the victors themselves had to depend upon chance for their own rations, it must have been but too frequently felt; and two massacres under such compulsion would suffice to give them a religious character, and render them sacred.

The capital punishment of criminals at stated times would also assume a similar character in a short period. Vindictiveness has, likewise, had a share as much in suggesting human sacrifices as in bringing anthropophagism into vogue.

Moreover, it being admitted that a fierce, sanguinary divinity, who helped his worshippers in achieving success in warfare, would delight in receiving sanguinary offerings, vows and promises to make them on the result of a projected, or impending, battle proving favourable, or on the attainment of some coveted object, would naturally follow; and the simple-minded people who made such vows and promises would not fail to keep them with punctilious care.

Moreover, the practice, so common in pre-historic and proto-historic times (and not altogether a thing of the past in the present day), of showing respect or affection to chiefs and seniors at their funerals by slaughtering, and sometimes, but rarely, burying alive some of their wives, concubines, and slaves, as also their horses and dogs, to accompany them, and to minister to their comfort in another world, was, by its frequent repetition on so solemn an occasion as a funeral, just what would give a religious character to such slaughter, and convert it into a holy sacrifice.

Yet again, the art of the magician, which in primitive times included that of the sorcerer and the soothsayer, had to resort to the most outlandish, uncouth, and extraordinary means to retain its hold on the minds of ignorant, credulous, and superstitious people, and what could be more mysterious and awe-inspiring than communion with the dead and the slaughter of human beings under the most harrowing circumstances? and that such slaughter under the peculiar state of ancient society would be associated with religion was but natural.*

Lastly, a vitiated desire for human flesh as an article of choice food was, it would seem, pretty prevalent in rude primitive barbarous times, but as this desire could not be satisfied except at uncertain times when strangers or prisoners were available, the indulgence in it necessarily partook of the character of a feast, and that again soon passed into a religious observance.

* Dr. Desgentiles, in his *Histoire Médicale de l'Armée d'Orient*, denies this charge, but Napoleon himself says, "I was obliged to leave behind all who could not follow us. There were fifty men sick of the plague who could not move with the army, and who must be left to the ferocious Djezzar. I caused opium to be administered to them to release them from their suffering." (Jomini, I, p. 231.) The charge was at the time generally believed.

Thus anthropopathy resulting in devotion, penance, rejoicings, vows and a desire to avert evil, or secure a coveted object by divine intervention, vindictiveness, expediency, respect for the dead, necromancy and depraved appetite, would all tend to human sacrifices; and that they did so, is abundantly evident from the history of human civilization in ancient times. To quote, however, a few instances by way of proofs, though many of them must be familiar to most of my readers.

The Phœnicians frequently offered human victims to their sanguinary gods Ba'al and Moloch to appease their thirst for blood. The Carthaginians did the same to the same divinities. The Druids, both in Great Britain and Scandinavia, likewise, satisfied the spirit of their gods by human sacrifices, often burning large numbers of men in wicker baskets. The Scythians testified their devotion by immolating hundreds at a time. In the Thargalia of the Athenians, a man and a woman were annually sacrificed to expiate the sins of the nation. Homer mentions that twelve Trojan captives were killed at the funeral of Patroclus,* and Menelaus was seized by the Egyptians for sacrificing young children with the Greek notion of appeasing the winds.† As an act of vindictive devotion, Augustus immolated three hundred citizens of Perusia before his deified uncle Divus Julius. The cruel practice of the Cyclops feasting on their prisoners-of-war is well known. According to Euripides, "the most agreeable repast to the Cyclops was the flesh of strangers,"‡ and Homer describes that six of the comrades of Ulysses were devoured by Scylla in the cavern of the Cyclops.§ One passage on the subject gives a vivid picture of the cruel practice, and I quote Pope's version of it entire.

"He answered with his deed; his bloody hand
Snatched two unhappy of my martial band,
And dashed like dogs against the rocky floor.
The pavement swims with brains and mingled gore.
Torn limb from limb, he spreads the horrid feast,
And fierce devours it like a mountain beast.
He sucks the marrow, and the blood he drains;
Nor entrails, flesh, nor solid bone remains.
We see the death, from which we cannot move,
And humbled groan beneath the hand of Jove." Od. L. I., v. 282.

Doubtless there is much poetical embellishment in this extract, but divested of it it shows that the Cyclops indulged in human sacrifice. The cavern evidently was, like many others on the shores of the Mediterranean Sea, temples where the horrid rite of anthropothusia was regularly observed,

* Il. XI. 33.

† Herodot., II. 119.

‡ Euripides, Cyclops, V. 126.

§ Bryant's Ancient Mythology, II., pp. 15 ff.

and shipwrecked mariners were the persons who afforded the readiest victims.

The Lamiaë and the Lestrygons were equally cruel in their religious observances. Adverting to the former, Bryant says, "The Lamiaë were not only to be found in Italy, and Sicily, but Greece, Pontus, and Libya. And however widely they may have been separated, they are still represented in the same unfavourable light. Euripides says that their very name was detestable. Philostratus speaks of their bestial appetite, and unnatural gluttony. And Aristotle alludes to practices still more shocking: as if they tore open the bodies big with child, that they might get at the infant to devour it. I speak, says he, of people, who have brutal appetites.*

These descriptions are perhaps carried to a great excess; yet the history was founded on truth: and shews plainly what fearful impressions were left upon the minds of men from the barbarity of the first ages.

"One of the principal places in Italy, where the Lamiaë seated themselves, was about Formiaë; of which Horace takes notice in his Ode to Ælius Lamia.

Æli, vetusto nobilis ab Lamo, &c.
Auctore ab illo ducis originem,
Qui Formiarum mœnia dicitur
Princeps, et innantem Maricæ
Littoribus tenuisse Lirim.

"The chief temple of the Formians was upon the sea-coast at Caiete. It is said to have had its name from a woman who died here: and whom some make the nurse of Æneas, others of Ascanius, others still of Creusa.† The truth is this: it stood near a cavern, sacred to the god Ait, called Ate, Atis, and Attis; and it was hence called Caieta, and Caiatta. Strabo says, that it was denominated from a cave, though he did not know the precise etymology.‡ There were also in the rock some wonderful subterranean, which branched out into various apartments. Here the ancient Lamii, the priests of Ham, resided:§ whence Silius Italicus, when he speaks of the place, styles it Regnata Lamo Caieta.|| They undoubtedly sacrificed children here, and probably the same custom was common among the Lamii, as prevailed

* Aristol. Ethics, L. 7., c. 6, p. 118.

† Virgil. Æn. L. 7. V. 1.

‡ Strabo, L. 5, p. 357.

§ Ibid., p. 356.

|| Silius, L. 8.

among the Lacedæmonians, who used to whip their children round the altar of Diana Orthia. Thus much we are assured by Fulgentius, and others, that the usual term among the ancient Latines for the whipping of children was Caiatio. Apud Antiquos Caiatio dicebatur puerilis cædes.”*

It is generally believed that the Syrens were no other than priestesses of anthropothusiæ temples on the coast of Campania, and they derived their infamous notoriety, most probably, from the part they took in the immolation of shipwrecked mariners; “for Campania at one time was as dreaded as Rhegium and Sicily, for the dangers which awaited those who navigated their coasts.” The priestesses were invariably selected with special reference to their personal charms, and the most important part in the service of their temples was singing of hymns in which the Syrens were so far perfect, that they were formerly believed to have been the daughters of Terpsichore according to some, and of Melpomene or Calliope according to others. After quoting the account of the Syrens given by Homer (Od. M. v. 39 et seq.), Bryant says “The story at bottom relates to the people abovementioned, who with their music used to entice strangers into the purlieus of their temples, and then put them to death. Nor was it music only, with which persons were induced to follow them. The female part of their choirs were (*sic*) maintained for a twofold purpose, both on account of their voices and their beauty. They were accordingly very liberal of their favours, and by these means enticed seafaring persons, who paid dearly for their entertainment.”† That Scylla, who destroyed some of the followers of Ulysses and of whom mention has already been made, was a priestess of this class, is now generally admitted. According to Tzetzes, “she was originally a handsome wench, but being too free with seafaring people, she made herself a beast.” “Ἦν δὲ πρῶτον Σκύλλα γύνη εὐπρεπής. Ποσειδῶνι δὲ συνοῦσα ἀπεθηριώθη.” The story of Saturn devouring his own children—a failing which has also been attributed to Ops, and, according to a passage of Euhemerus transmitted by Ennis, said to have been common among “the rest of mankind”—*Saturnum et Opem, cæterosque tum homines humanam carnem solitos esitare*—is very justly supposed by Bryant to be due to the practice of immolation of children in the temples of that divinity “in a ceremony styled ὠμοφάγια, at which time they eat the flesh quite crude with the blood. In Crete, at the Dionusiaca they used to tear the flesh with their teeth from the animal, when alive. This they did in commemoration of Dionusus. Festos funeris dies statuunt, et annum sacrum trietericâ consecratione componunt, omnia per ordinem facientes, quæ puer moriens aut fecit, aut passus est. Vivum laniant dentibus taurum, crudeles epulas annuis commemorationibus excitantes. Apollonius Rhodius, speaking of persons like to Bacchanalians,

* De Virgilianâ continentîâ, p. 762. Bryant's Ancient Myth. II., pp. 15 ff.

† Bryant's Ancient Mythology, II, p. 20.

represents them (*Θνασιν ὠμοβοροῖς ἱκελαι*) as savage as the Thyades, who delighted in bloody banquets. Upon this the Scholiast observes, that the Mænades, and Bacchæ, used to devour the raw limbs of animals, which they had cut or torn asunder. In the island of Chios it was a religious custom to tear a man's limb by way of sacrifice to Dionusus. The same obtained in Tenedos. It is Porphyry who gives the account. He was a staunch Pagan, and his evidence on that account is of consequence. He quotes for the rites of Tenedos Euelpis the Carystian. From all which we may learn one sad truth, that there is scarce any thing so impious and unnatural, as not at times to have prevailed.* It is said, Orpheus first put a stop to this disgustingly cruel custom; but, according to some, he only stopped the practice of eating raw flesh, but did not succeed in altogether suppressing the rite.

Referring to the inhabitants of Cyprus, Herodotus says: "The people of this place worship the virgin goddess Artemis; at whose shrine they sacrifice all persons who have the misfortune to be shipwrecked upon their coast: and all the Grecians that they can lay hold of, when they are at any time thither driven. All these they, without any ceremony, brain with a club. Though others say that they shove them off headlong from a precipice, for their temple is founded upon a cliff."† This Artemis was the counterpart of the Indian Kálí, to whom human sacrifices were offered until very recently, as will be shown further on. Even the casting of the victim headlong from the top of a cliff was not unknown in India, for we are informed by Dr. Hendley in his interesting account of the Maiwár Bhíls (*ante* XLIV, p. 350) that "at installations at Jodhpur, buffaloes and goats are to this day sacrificed in front of the four-armed Devi, and thrown down the rock face of the fort. So again, at the very ancient temple of Devi on the Chitor Hill." "These are," he adds, "relics of aboriginal worship;" but of this there is no proof. "A goat is still offered daily at the shrine of Ambádeví, at Amber the ancient capital of Dhundár, or Jaipúr, as a substitute for the human victim formerly stated to have been sacrificed at the same place." The story of the Deví who wanted and got seven consecutive royal victims from a chieftain of Chitor, so spiritedly narrated by Colonel Tod, must be fresh in the mind of the reader.

The Assyrians, like the people on the shores of the Mediterranean, freely indulged in human sacrifices, and imagined that such sacrifices were the most acceptable offerings they could make to their gods.

According to Diodorus "red-haired men were formerly sacrificed by the Egyptian kings at the altar of Osiris.‡" And Plutarch quotes a

* Bryant's Ancient Mythology, II, pp. 12 ff.

† L. iv, C. 103.

‡ Diodor., I. 88.

passage from Manetho to show that “formerly in the city of Idithya, they were wont to burn even men alive, giving them the name of Typhons, and winnowing their ashes through a sieve to scatter and disperse them in the air; which human sacrifices were performed in public, at a stated season of the year during 873.”* Herodotus denied the correctness of these statements; and Sir Gardner Wilkinson argues that “it is directly contrary to the usages of the Egyptians, and totally inconsistent with the feeling of a civilized people;” but religious observances and social customs are such irreconcilable riddles that *à priori* arguments founded on them appear to me to be simply unfit for the elucidation of truth. Few would question the civilization of the Romans—so much higher than that of the Egyptians—or admitting it deny the fact that they devoted their prisoners-of-war to carnage for the entertainment of the people of their metropolis; not to advert to their practice of sacrificing human victims until so recently as the first century before the Christian era, when (A. U. C. 657) during the consulship of Cneius Cornelius Lentulus and P. Licinius Crassus a decree was promulgated by the senate prohibiting human sacrifices.† The horrors of the Inquisition during the middle ages may also be referred to, to show how the immolation of large numbers of men may be consistent with a high state of civilization and a humane religion. Certain it is that the principles on which human sacrifices got into currency were fully recognised by the Egyptians; thus they held that “sacrifices ought not to be of things in themselves agreeable to the gods, but, on the contrary, of creatures into which the souls of the wicked have passed” (Plutarch, *des Is.* s. 31); they offered the entrails of the dead to certain inferior gods or genii; and their kings, after every victory, repaired to the temple of their chief divinity, “performed sacrifice, offered suitable thanksgivings”, and lastly “dedicated the spoil of the conquered enemy, and expressed their gratitude for the privilege of laying before the feet of the god, the giver of victory, those prisoners they had brought to the vestibule of the divine abode.”‡ It may be that the actual sacrifice of men took place at a very early period, and it was subsequently replaced by emblematic offering; but there is no reason to doubt that at one time or other the rite of anthropothusia did obtain currency among them. Wilkinson, with all his anxiety to defend the credit of the Egyptians, is constrained to admit this.§

The ancient Jews were in many respects better than their neighbours, but the idea of human sacrifice seems not to have been unknown to them. When Abraham was commanded to offer up his son, he did not even evince

* *Athen.*, IV, p. 172.

† *Pliny*, XXX, c. 3.

‡ *Wilkinson's Ancient Egyptians* II, p. 286.

§ *Ibid.*, II, p. 343.

any repugnance or surprise, and the vow of Jephtha, which was literally carried out by the sacrifice of his daughter, affords a positive proof on the subject. The offering of children to Moloch, which the Jews evidently borrowed from their neighbours, is also remarkable as bearing strongly on the question at issue.

Of all the different races of America, the Aztecs were the most civilized. Their social institutions, their palaces, their elective form of government, were such as to claim for them a very high position as a nation, and yet their addiction to human sacrifice was such as would disgrace the lowest savages. At their coronations, "the new monarch", says Prescott, "was installed in his regal dignity with much parade of religious ceremony; but not until, by a victorious campaign, he had obtained a sufficient number of captives to grace his triumphal entry into the capital, and to furnish victims for the dark and bloody rites which stained the Aztec superstition."* The number immolated at such times was prodigious; nor was the coronation the only time when this horrid rite was celebrated. Adopted in the beginning of the fourteenth century, it was not very frequent at first; "it became", according to the historian, "more frequent with the wider extent of their empire till at length, almost every festival was closed with this cruel abomination."† The total was variously estimated at from twenty thousand to fifty thousand in ordinary years, and rising, on great occasions, such as a coronation or the dedication of an important temple, as that of Huitzilpotchli in 1486, to a hundred thousand. The heads of the victims were preserved in Golgothas, in one of which the companions of Cortes counted one hundred and thirty-six thousand skulls. The details varied according to circumstances, and the nature of the divinity to whose honour the rite was celebrated, but they were generally of the most disgusting and cruel kind possible; attended by preliminary tortures, which Prescott justly compares with the fantastic creations of the Florentine poet as pictured in the twenty-first canto of his 'Inferno'. Neither sex nor age offered an immunity to the unfortunate captive from his cruel doom, and in seasons of draught, infants were particularly sought as the meetest offering to the rain-god Tluloc. The object in this case was exactly the same for which the Khonds of western Orissa sacrificed their Meriah to the Earth Goddess, Tári Pennu, and the manner in which they treated the Meriah corresponds in many respects with that of the Aztecs. The following extract gives the details of an ordinary sacrifice of the Aztecs:

"One of their most important festivals was that in honour of the god Tezcatlepoça, whose rank was inferior only to that of the Supreme Being. He was called 'the soul of the world', and supposed to have been its Crea-

* Conquest of Mexico, I, p. 22.

† Ibid., p. 67.

tor. He was depicted as a handsome man, endowed with perpetual youth. A year before the intended sacrifice, a captive, distinguished for his personal beauty, and without a blemish on his body, was selected to represent this deity. Certain tutors took charge of him, and instructed him how to perform his new part with becoming grace and dignity. He was arrayed in a splendid dress, regaled with incense, and with a profusion of sweet-scented flowers, of which the ancient Mexicans were as fond as their descendants at the present day. When he went abroad, he was attended by a train of the royal pages, and, as he halted in the streets to play some favourite melody, the crowd prostrated themselves before him, and did him homage as the representative of their good deity. In this way he led an easy, luxurious life, till within a month of his sacrifice. Four beautiful girls, bearing the names of the principal goddesses, were then selected to share the honours of his bed; and with them he continued to live in idle dalliance, feasted at the banquets of the principal nobles, who paid him all the honours of a divinity.

“At length the fatal day of sacrifice arrived. The term of his short-lived glories was at an end. He was stripped of his gaudy apparel, and bade adieu to the fair partners of his revelries. One of the royal barges transported him across the lake to a temple which rose on its margin, about a league from the city. Hither the inhabitants of the capital flocked, to witness the consummation of the ceremony. As the sad procession wound up the sides of the pyramid, the unhappy victim threw away his gay chaplets of flowers, and broke in pieces the musical instruments with which he had solaced the hours of captivity. On the summit he was received by six priests, whose long and matted locks, flowed disorderly over their sable robes, covered with hieroglyphic scrolls of mystic import. They led him to the sacrificial stone, a huge block of jasper, with its upper surface somewhat convex. On this the prisoner was stretched. Five priests secured his head and his limbs: while the sixth, clad in a scarlet mantle, emblematic of his bloody office, dexterously opened the breast of the wretched victim with a sharp razor of *itztli*, a volcanic substance hard as flint,—and, inserting his hand in the wound, tore out the palpitating heart. The minister of death, first holding this up towards the sun, an object of worship throughout Anahac, cast it at the feet of the deity to whom the temple was devoted, while the multitudes below prostrated themselves in humble adoration. The tragic story of this prisoner was expounded by the priests as the type of human destiny, which, brilliant in its commencement, too often closes in sorrow and disaster.”*

Nor did the Aztecs rest satisfied with this offering to their gods. “The most loathsome part of the story, the manner in which the body of the

* Conquest of Mexico, I, pp. 68ff.

sacrificed captive was disposed of, remains to be told. It was delivered to the warrior who had taken him in battle, and by him, after being dressed, was served up in an entertainment to his friends. This was not the coarse repast of famished cannibals, but a banquet teeming with delicious viands, prepared with art, and attended by both sexes, who, as we shall see hereafter, conducted themselves with all the decorum of civilized life. Surely, never were refinement and the extreme of barbarism brought so closely in contact with each other.* Well may the historian exclaim, "Strange that in every country the most fiendish passions of the human heart have been kindled in the name of religion."

The neighbours of the Aztecs, the Toltecs and the Tezcaucans, as also the Incas, indulged in the loathsome and revolting rite, and often waged war with each other, simply for the sake of obtaining captives for their gods. It is even said that such wars were sometimes amicably arranged solely for the sake of captives for sacrifice.†

In South America, the Peruvians were strongly addicted to human sacrifices, and the Araucanians, though they are said to have been "sensible to the dictates of compassion", and a mild, sensible race averse to cruelty, were nevertheless sometimes given to the same practice. They celebrated a rite called *Pruloucon*, or "the Dance of the Dead", at which a prisoner-of-war was "sacrificed to the manes of the soldiers killed in the war." After subjecting the unfortunate victim to various kinds of ignominy, such as making him ride a horse deprived of his ears and tail, symbolically burying the good deeds of his national chiefs, and the like, "the Toqui, or one of his bravest companions to whom he relinquishes the honour of the execution, dashes out the brains of the prisoner with a club. The heart is immediately taken out by two attendants and presented palpitating to the general, who sucks a little of the blood, and passes it to his officers, who repeat in succession the same ceremony, in the mean time he fumigates with tobacco-smoke from his pipe the four cardinal points of the circle. The soldiers strip the flesh from the bones, and make of them flutes; then cutting off the head, carry it round upon a pike amidst the acclamations of the multitude, while, stamping in measured pace, they thunder out their dreadful war-song, accompanied by the mournful sound of these horrid instruments."‡

Of cannibalism pure and simple, such as that of some of the Pacific Islanders; of the people of Equatorial Africa, some of whom, the Murirumbites for instance, like human flesh raw, and others, like the Wadoe of the Coast, prefer to eat it roasted;§ of the "Mongols, who, according to

* Conquest of Mexico, p. 71.

† Ibid, p. 74. *Vide passim* Heaviside's *American Antiquities*.

‡ Abbé Don J. Ignatius Molina's *History of Chili*, II, p. 79.

§ Burton's *Lake Regions of Central Africa*, II, p. 114; also Du Chaillu's *Explorations in Equatorial Africa*.

Sir John Maundeville, regarded human ears "sowced in vynegre as a delectable dish"; of the Dyaks of Borneo who delight in "head-hunts"; of some South Eastern Chinese and Japanese of the middle ages, who drank the blood and eat the flesh of their captives, esteeming it the most savoury food in the world; of the Tartars, Turks, Mongols, Tibetans, Javanese, Sumatras and Andamanese* I need say nothing. The facts are well known; and however repulsive it may be to our common humanity to be told of the fact, it cannot be denied, that men under certain circumstances of society, do take to human flesh as an article of food.

That the practice of immolating wives, concubines, and slaves, at first originating from a mistaken sense of the future world and the requirements of the manes, did lead to associating such slaughter with religion can scarcely be doubted. Dr. Thurnem has put together a large number of instances of this practice, and the curious in such matters will find incontrovertible proofs on the subject in the thirty-seventh, the thirty-eighth, and the forty-second volumes of the *Archæologia*. The cruel rite of Satí must have originated from this cause, though the love and constancy of Hindu women soon gave it a high character for devotion as a voluntary sacrifice. The immolation of twelve Trojan youths, along with two dogs and four horses, on the funeral pyre of Patroclus† belongs to this class; and Tertullian says—"Olim quoniam animas defunctorum humano sanguine propitiari creditum est, captivos vel mali status servos mercati in exsequiis immolabant. Postea placuit impietatem voluptati adumbrare. Ita mortem homicidiis consolabantur."‡—It is supposed by some that the broken bones found in the Long Barrows of Great Britain are mostly of persons buried alive along with the individuals to whose honour the barrows were raised. The opinion, however, has, I believe, not been generally accepted by antiquarians.

* Col. Yule has collected a large number of facts illustrative of this subject, and I must refer the reader to his note. Marco Polo, 2nd Ed., I. pp. 302 ff.; II. pp. 245, 265, 275, 292. Adverting to Christianity, he says "The story of King Richard's banquet in presence of Saladin's ambassadors on the head of a Saracen curried (for so it surely was),—

' Soden full hastily
With powder and with spysory,
And with saffron of good colour'

fable as it is, is told with a zest that makes one shudder; but the tale in the *Chanson d'Antioche*, of how the licentious bands of ragamuffins, who hung on the army of the First Crusade, and were known as the *Jufurs*, ate the Turks whom they killed at the siege, looks very like an abominable truth, corroborated as it is by the prose chronicle of worse deeds at the ensuing siege of Thorra." *Loc. cit.*

† II. XXIII, 239.

‡ Tertullian, *De Spectaculis*, XII.

The human sacrifices in the temples on the eastern shore of the Mediterranean, to which reference has already been made, were often connected with soothsaying, the priests foretelling the future from the appearance of the entrails of the victim, and elsewhere the connexion of human sacrifice with necromancy, magic, sorcery, and other dark arts can be easily pointed out. Some alchemists slaughtered infants to help them in their attempt at discovering the elixir of life ; but I doubt if it led to any religious sacrifice.

The only two instances I am aware of of periodical jail delivery of prisoners sentenced to capital punishment leading to a religious festival, are the horrid rite which keeps the Ashantis in a whirl of excitement for a whole week every year, and that of the Yucatan ;* but they are quite enough to show that the conclusion I wish to draw from them, is perfectly legitimate.

The Persians were, perhaps, the only nation of ancient times who did not indulge in human sacrifice. As constituting the agricultural section of the great Aryan race, they contented themselves by offering the fruits of the field for the gratification of their divinity. And the Hindus, as more intimately connected with them than with the other branches of the Aryan race, we may suppose, did not differ much from the Persians ; but it is also certain that religious differences, depending principally upon the leaning of the Hindus in favour of animal sacrifice, made them break off from their brethren, and depart from their primitive home, and what is true of the Persians need not, therefore, necessarily be so of the Hindus. Besides there is nothing to show that they were incapable of doing what their contemporaries, the Assyrians, Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans did in the way of religious rite, and what appears from the instances quoted above to have been a failing or predilection common to almost all mankind. They were certainly highly civilized for the time in which they flourished, and the spirit of their institutions was so benign and pacific, that it may strike us as inconsistent to associate with it the disgusting rite of human sacrifice. Arguing upon these premises, Colebrooke and Wilson have come to the conclusion "that human sacrifices were not authorised by the Veda itself, but were either then abrogated and an emblematic ceremony substituted in their place, or they were introduced in later times by the authors of such works as the *Kaliká Purána.*"† As a Hindu writing on the actions of my ancestors—remote though they are,—it would have been a source of great satisfaction to me if I could adopt this conclusion as true ; but I regret I cannot do so consistently with my allegiance to the cause of history. Doubtless the institutions of the Vedic Hindus were of a benign and humane character, and that they did not tolerate brutality to the extent that other ancient nations indulged in, I can well believe ; but it must be added also that benign and

* Fancourt's *History of Yucatan*, p. 126.

† *Journal, R. As. Soc.*, XIII, p. 107.

humane as was the spirit of the ancient Hindu religion, it was not at all opposed to animal sacrifice; on the contrary, most of the principal rites required the immolation of large numbers of various kinds of beasts and birds. One of the rites enjoined required the performer to walk deliberately into the depth of the ocean, and drown himself to death. This was called *Maháprasthána*, and is forbidden in the present age. Another, an expiatory one, required the sinner to burn himself to death, on a blazing pyre—the *Tushánala*. This has not yet been forbidden; and it is what Calanus performed in the presence of Alexander the Great. The gentlest of beings, the simple-minded women of Bengal, were for a long time in the habit of consigning their first-born babes to the sacred river Ganges at Ságar Island, and this was preceded by a religious ceremony, though it was not authorised by any of the ancient rituals. For centuries men have courted death under the wheels of Jagannátha's car, under the delusion of that being the most meritorious act of devotion which they could perform, and with the fond assurance that they would thereby secure for themselves the highest reward in a future life. And if the spirit of Hindu religion has tolerated, countenanced, or promoted such acts, it would not be by any means unreasonable or inconsistent to suppose that it should have, in primitive times, recognised the slaughter of human beings as calculated to appease, gratify, and secure the grace of, the gods.

But to turn from presumptive evidence to the facts recorded in the Vedas. The earliest reference to human sacrifice occurs, according to the Hindus, in that most ancient record of the Aryan race, the Sañhitá of the Rig Veda, to which obviously Colebrooke and Wilson refer by the use of the word Veda in the singular number. The first book of that work includes seven hymns* supposed to have been recited by one S'unahsépha when he was bound to a stake, preparatory to being immolated. He prays earnestly that he may be allowed "to behold again his father and mother"; that "Varuṇa, undisdainful, may bestow a thought upon him"; that "he may not take away his existence"; that "he may not make the petitioner an object of death"; that he "may loose the petitioner from the upper bonds, and untie the centre, and the lower, so that he may live." One verse says "S'unahsépha, seized and bound to the three-footed tree (the sacrificial post), has invoked the son of Aditi; may the regal Varuṇa, wise and irresistible, liberate him; may he let loose his bonds." (p. 63.) These quotations afford a strong presumptive evidence that S'unahsépha was intended for a sacrifice; though there be no positive mention of the fact in the Sañhitá, and the hymns contain many prayers for wealth, cattle, and other blessings, which any person may ask without being in the position of a victim at a cruel sacrifice.

* Wilson's Rig Veda, I, pp. 59 f.

The Aitareya Bráhmaṇa of the Rig Veda gives the details of the story which connects these hymns with a human sacrifice. The story has been quoted at length by Wilson, in his paper "On the sacrifice of Human Beings as an Element of the Ancient Religion of India"* and by Max Müller, in his "Ancient Sanskrit Literature" (pp. 408 ff.); who has also printed the text, and pointed out the variations of the Sâṅkháyaṇa Sútra version of it (*ibid*, p. 573); it likewise occurs in its place in Haug's translation of the Aitareya Bráhmaṇa (pp. 460 ff.), I need not, therefore, reproduce it here. Suffice it to say that according to it, one Harishchandra had made a vow to immolate his first-born to Varuṇa, if that divinity would bless him with children: a child was born named Rohita, and Varuṇa claimed it; but the father evaded fulfilling his promise, until Rohita, grown up to man's estate ran away from home, when Varuṇa afflicted the father with dropsy; at last Rohita purchased one S'unahsépha from Ajigarta for a hundred head of cattle, had him tied to a stake, and was about to have him immolated in redemption of his father's vow to Varuṇa, when the victim, at the suggestion of Viśvámitra, recited the hymns, and was thereby released. The story is, with some slight variations in minor details, reproduced in the Rámáyana, the Mahábhárata, and the Bhágavata Purána. The Aitareya Bráhmaṇa gives seriatim the initials of the several hymns as they were supposed to have been recited, and as they occur in the Sañhitá, but the other works refer to them generally, without any specific quotation.

It is unquestionable that the works in which the story is given, are of ages long subsequent to the date of the Sañhitá, and their evidence cannot be accepted as conclusive. Arguing upon this datum and the absence of all mention of a human sacrifice in the Sañhitá, Rosen, Wilson and others are of opinion that the hymns cannot be associated with a human sacrifice. Wilson explains that the "upper, middle, and lower bonds" referred to in the hymns, and which Indian commentators accept to mean the thongs with which the head, the waist, and the legs of the victim were tied to the sacrificial post, have been used metaphorically to imply the bondage of sin; but he admits that the reference to the "three-footed tree," the sacrificial post, "is consistent with the popular legend."† He says nothing about the seizure, referred to in the verse above quoted, but that too affords a strong argument in favour of the interpretation adopted by the author of the Aitareya Bráhmaṇa. We have also to bear in mind that, whatever their age, the Bráhmaṇas are the oldest exposition we possess, of the origin, scope and purport of the hymns of the Sañhitás, dating as they do, according to European orientalists, from five to ten centuries before the Christian era, and to reject their interpretation in favour of conclusions drawn by persons of this century, would be to reject proof in favour of conjecture; and that conjecture

* Journal, R. As. Soc., XIII, pp. 96 ff.

† Rig Veda, I, p. 63.

founded in many instances upon very contracted and narrow views of modern canons of criticism, of laws of unity and propriety, of consistency and habits and modes of thinking, which are not always applicable to those records.

It may be noted also that the conclusion drawn by the learned orientologists from the above facts is, that the sacrifice of human beings did not form an element of the ancient religion of India, and this is not warranted by the premises. Doubtless the details of a sacrifice are not given in the Sañhitá, but, taking the Sañhitá to be, as it unquestionably is, only a collection of hymns divested of all connecting links, we have no right to expect them there. It would be as reasonable to expect all the details of a story in a hymn improvised by the hero of it, to meet a particular contingency, as to expect the whole plot of a novel from a single speech in it. The absence of reference to any rite, custom, or observance, in a book of hymns, however sacred that book may be, is no proof of that rite, custom, or observance having never existed among those who held the said hymns to be sacred. To accept it as such, is to attach an importance to negative evidence to which it has no claim, and in the case under notice there is enough, as shown above, to warrant an opposite conclusion.

Besides, "the ancient religion of India", referred to by the learned Professors Wilson and Rosen, can mean either the religion of the aborigines, or that of the Indo-Aryans, and as in the case of the former no reference would be required to the Vedas, it is to be presumed that the early religion of the Indo-Aryans is referred to; and if so, we cannot look to the Sañhitá apart from the Bráhmanas. What we call ancient Hinduism is founded on the Bráhmanas, and cannot possibly be dissociated from it. We can easily conceive that the religion of the Aryans before they had finally settled in India differed from it in many respects, and we can find conjectures about it on certain slender facts to be gleaned from the Sañhitá of the Rig Veda and the Zendavesta; but we cannot, without misleading, call that religion, whatever it was, "the religion of ancient India." The Bráhmanas may have, for aught we know to the contrary, changed the ancient rites, and introduced new ones; and it is unquestionable that many of their legends and anecdotes were got up merely by way of illustrations, and have no claim to be believed as true, (the professors of the Mimáñsá school stigmatize them often as *arthaváda* or eulogistic) but we cannot discard them, and replace their testimony by conjecture.

At any rate the story of S'unahsépha must be accepted as a positive proof in favour of the theory that at the time of the Aitareya Bráhmana, the Hindus did tolerate human sacrifice. To assume that the sacrifice referred to in it was a symbolical one in which there was no intention whatever to make a sanguinary offering, would be totally to destroy the *raison d'être* of the legend, to divest it of all its sensational elements, and to make it

quite flat, stale, and unprofitable. The great object of the legend, whether it be intrinsically true or false, was to extol the merits of the hymns in rescuing a victim from a sacrificial stake; but if the stake be divested of its horrors, that object would be entirely defeated. Then, if Harischandra did not intend actually to give up his son to Varuṇa, the promise to “sacrifice his son when born” would be unmeaning, and the frequent evasions he resorted to, by saying, “an animal is fit for being sacrificed when it is more than ten days old”; “it is not fit for sacrifice until it has teeth”; “it is not fit until the milk teeth are shed”; “it is not fit until the permanent teeth are all come out”; “a man of the warrior caste is fit for being sacrificed only after having received his full armour”, were quite uncalled for, and gratuitous attempts at cheating a dread divinity whom he adored, and to whom he was bound by a solemn vow; for he could have at any time easily subjected the son to the ceremony of being tied to a stake, and after repeating a few mantras over him let him off, perfectly sound in wind and limb. The running away of the son from his father would also be unmeaning; the purchase of a substitute stupid; the payment of a fee of a hundred head of cattle to undertake the butcher’s work quite supererogatory; and the sharpening of the knife by Ajigarta a vain preliminary. The Bráhmaṇa makes Śunahśepa express much disgust at the sight of Ajigarta, his father, sharpening a knife to slaughter him. “What is not found even in the hand of a Śúdra”, it makes him say, “one has seen in thy hand, the knife to kill thy son”; but it has not a word in depreciation of the rite itself. It is said in the Bráhmaṇa that Śunahśepa, after his rescue, was so disgusted with his father that he forsook him, and became the adopted son of Viśvámitra, who named him *Devarát* or *Diodotus*, “the god-given”, and became the head of one of the several branches of the descendants of Viśvámitra. Śunahśepa was a grown-up man at the time, and was perfectly familiar with the Śástras, for he is described to have, immediately after, officiated at the ceremony, and to have introduced some innovations in the ritual; if the whole rite were purely symbolical, he had no business to be offended with his father, a learned Bráhmaṇ of high caste, and become the adopted son of a Kshatriya.

The writer of this note claims to be a descendant of this Devarát, and, in common with a large number of men in different parts of India, at every solemn ceremony, is required by the Śástras and the custom of his ancestors to describe himself as belonging to the tribe (*gotra*) of Viśvámitra, and of the family (*pravara*) of Devarát; he is not prepared, therefore, to say that Śunahśepa is purely a mythical personage; and seeing that, until the beginning of this century, the practice of offering the first-born to the river Ganges was common, and the story simply says that Śunahśepa was offered to the water-god Varuṇa as a substitute for the first-born Rohita,

he can perceive nothing in it inconsistent or unworthy of belief. The rescue, of course, is due to the intervention of Viśvámitra, as supposed by Wilson, and not to the efficacy of the hymns, but that was not intended to form the most salient point of the story.

Exception has been taken to the theory of the sacrifice having been originally intended to be real on the ground of a story in the Aitareya Bráhmaṇa which narrates that “the gods once killed a man for their sacrifice, but that part in him which was fit for being made an offering, went out and entered a horse”; then the horse being killed, it went to an ox; and the ox being killed, it went to a sheep; and the sheep being killed, it went to a goat; and the goat being killed, it went to the earth; and the gods, guarding the earth, seized the rice, the produce thereof, which, made into cakes, formed the best offering, and all the animals from which the sacrificial part had gone, became unfit for being sacrificed, and no one should eat them.* This story,

* I quote the entire passage from Haug’s translation to enable the reader to judge for himself:

“The gods killed a man for their sacrifice. But that part in him which was fit for being made an offering, went out and entered a horse. Thence the horse became an animal fit for being sacrificed. The gods then dismissed that man after that part which was only fit for being offered had gone from him, whereupon he became deformed.

“The gods killed the horse; but the part fit for being sacrificed (the *medha*) went out of it, and entered an ox; thence the ox became an animal fit for being sacrificed. The gods then dismissed (this horse) after the sacrificial part had gone from it, whereupon it turned to a white deer.

“The gods killed the ox; but the part fit for being sacrificed went out of the ox, and entered a sheep; thence the sheep became fit for being sacrificed. The gods then dismissed the ox, which turned to a gayal (*Bos gaevus*).

“The gods killed the sheep; but the part fit for being sacrificed went out of the sheep, and entered a goat; thence the goat became fit for being sacrificed. The gods dismissed the sheep, which turned to a camel.

“The sacrificial part (the *medha*) remained for the longest time (longer than in the other animals) in the goat; thence is the goat among all these animals pre-eminently fit for being sacrificed.

“The gods killed the goat; but the part fit for being sacrificed went out of it, and entered the earth. Thence the earth is fit for being offered. The gods then dismissed the goat, which turned to a Śarabha.

“All those animals from which the sacrificial part had gone, are unfit for being sacrificed; thence one should not eat (their flesh).

“After the sacrificial part had entered the earth, the gods surrounded it (so that no escape was possible); it then turned to rice. When they (therefore) divide the Purodâsa into parts, after they have killed the animal, then they do it, wishing “might not animal sacrifice be performed with the sacrificial part (which is contained in the rice of the Purodâsa)! might our sacrificial part be provided with the whole sacrificial essence!” The sacrificial animal of him who has such a knowledge becomes then provided with the sacrificial part, with the whole sacrificial essence. The Purodâsa (offered at the animal sacrifice) is the animal which is killed. The chaff and straw of the rice of which it con-

however, proves too much. If it is to be accepted as an evidence against the existence of human sacrifice in the time of the Aitareya Bráhmaṇa, it must be allowed to tell equally against all animal sacrifices; but curiously enough, immediately after the story, the Bráhmaṇa supplies the necessary mantras for offering the omentum (*Vapá*) of a slaughtered animal; and, in five hundred different places, it furnishes directions for selecting, offering, slaughtering, and dividing among the officiating priests, goats, sheep, oxen, and other animals. In short, all the principal rites of the Bráhmaṇa period required animal sacrifices, and it would be absurd to believe on the strength of the story in question that in the time of the Aitareya Bráhmaṇa there was no horse sacrifice, no cow sacrifice, no goat sacrifice, and everywhere rice cakes were substituted for sanguinary offerings. It would be equally absurd for the Puráṇas to prohibit the Purusha-medha and the horse sacrifice in the Káliyuga, if they had been already prohibited in the Vedas. The fact, however, is, the story is simply eulogistic (*arthaváda*) and not at all intended to be prohibitive. In the Bráhmaṇas every rite, when being enjoined, is the best of rites, as in the Puráṇas every sacred pool is the holiest of the holy, and every god the greatest among gods; and as the object of the story was to praise the rice cake, it at once made it supersede all other kinds of offering. The Mímáṅsakas invariably adopt this style of explanation to reconcile all contradictory passages in the Vedas, and it is, I think, the only reasonable one that can be adopted in such cases. Jaimini distinctly lays down that “nothing is binding in the Vedas, which is not positively enjoined as a duty” (*Chodanálakshano'rtho dharmah*), and devotes a whole chapter (Book I, Chap. 2,) to what are mere *arthaváda* or eulogistic, including all Vedic legends under that head.

Colebrooke's opinion on the subject was founded upon a passage in the Satapatha Bráhmaṇa of the White Yajur Veda, in which the human victims at a Purushamedha are recommended to be let off after certain mantras had been repeated over them; but that passage cannot be accepted as a proof in the case under notice. The word *Purusha-medha*, it is true, literally means “a human sacrifice”; but it is not a common term descriptive of every rite in which a human victim is offered to the gods, for there were

sists are the hairs of the animal, its husks the skin, its smallest particles the blood, all the fine particles to which the (cleaned) rice is ground (for making, by kneading it with water, a ball) represent the flesh (of the animal), and whatever other substantial part is in the rice, are the bones (of the animal). He who offers the Purodáśa, offers the sacrificial substance of all animals (for the latter is contained in the rice of the Purodáśa). Thence they say: the performance of the Purodáśa offering is to be attended to.

“Now he recites the Yâjyâ for the Vapâ (which is about to be offered) Yuvam etâni divi, *i. e.*, Ye, O Agni and Soma, have placed, by your joint labours, those lights on the sky! Ye Agni and Soma, have liberated the rivers which had been taken (by demons), from imprecation and defilement.” *Haug's Translation*, pp. 90 ff.

several such; but a technical one, implying a specific ceremony to be performed in the spring season, according to certain fixed and well defined rules, which, according to the Puráṇas was altogether prohibited in the present iron age, and has no relation whatever to the sacrifice of children in redemption of vows. Whether the latter was ever prohibited or not, I cannot state positively; but that the sacrifice of S'unahsépha to the water-god Varuṇa was the type on which the offering of infants to the water-goddess Gangá at the confluence of the river of that name with the sea, the emblem of the water-god Varuṇa, I have no reason to doubt; and the latter was duly and pretty extensively observed for centuries, until finally put down by the British Government at the beginning of this century. It should be added here that the offering did not invariably or even generally lead to a murder, for a priest or bystander generally took up the child from the water, and brought him up as a foster son, very much in the same way as Viśvámitra did in the case of S'unahsépha.

The *Purusha-medha* was celebrated for the attainment of supremacy over all created beings. Its performance was limited to Bráhmaṇas and Kshatríyas. It could be commenced only on the tenth of the waxing moon in the month of Chaitra, and altogether it required forty days for its performance, though only five out of the forty days were specially called the days of the *Purusha-medha*, whence it got the name of *Pancháha*. Eleven sacrificial posts were required for it, and to each of them was tied an animal fit for Agni and Soma, (a barren cow) the human victims being placed between the posts.

The earliest indication of this rite occurs in the Vájasaneyí Sañhitá of the White Yajur Veda. The passage in it bearing on the subject is supposed to describe the different kinds of human victims appropriate for particular gods and goddesses. The section, in which it occurs, opens with three verses which, the commentator says, were intended to serve as mantras for offerings of human victims. Then follows a series of one hundred and seventy-nine names of gods in the dative case, each followed by the name of one or more persons in the objective case; thus "to Brahma a Bráhmaṇa, to Kshatra a Kshatríya," &c. The copula is nowhere given, and it is quite optional with the reader to supply whatever verb he chooses. The whole of these names has been reproduced in the Taittiríya Bráhmaṇa of the Black Yajur Veda, with only a few slight variations, and in some cases having the verb *álabhate* after them. This verb is formed of the root *labh* "to kill" with the prefix *á*, and commentators have generally accepted the term to mean slaughter, though in some cases it means consecration before slaughter. The century of Bráhmaṇas of the White Yajur Veda also accepts the passage to be descriptive of human victims, and under the circumstance we may unhesitatingly take it in that sense, though the arguments by which the hymns

of the Rig Veda have been attempted to be divorced from their commentary in the Aitareya Bráhmaṇa may be fairly brought to bear upon it.

As the passage in the Taittiríya is a curious one, though long, I shall quote it entire, pointing out within brackets in the foot notes the differences observable in the Vájasaneyí Sañhitá. It runs thus :

1. "To a (divinity of the) Bráhmaṇ (caste), a Bráhmaṇa should be sacrificed (*álabhate*) ; 2. To a (divinity of the) Kshatríya (caste), a Kshatríya ; 3. To the Maruts, a Vaisya ; 4. To Tapas (the divinity presiding over penances), a Súdra ; 5. To Tamas (the presiding divinity of darkness) a thief ; 6. To Naraka (the divinity of hells), a Víraṇa (one who blows out sacrificial fires) ; 7. To Pápaman (the divinity of sins), a hermaphrodite (or a eunuch) ; 8. To Akraya (the divinity of commerce), an Ayogu (one who acts against the ordinances of the Sástra) ; 9. To Káma (the divinity of love), a courtesan ; 10. To Atikrushta (a detested divinity), a Mágadha (the son of a Vaisya by a Kshatriya woman)* ;

11. To Gíta (the divinity of music), a Síta or musician (the son of a Kshatriya by a Bráhmaṇa woman) ; 12. To Nritta (the divinity of dancing), one who lends his wife to another (a cuckold)† ; 13. To Dharma (the divinity of duty), one who frequents assemblies and preaches morality ; 14. To Narma (the divinity of humour), a wit ; 15. To Narishta (a dependent goddess), a coward ; 16. To Hasa (the divinity of laughter), a person of an ambling gait ; 17. To Ananda (the divinity of delight), a favourite of women ; 18. To Pramada (the divinity of joy), the son of an unmarried woman ; 19. To Medhá (the goddess of intelligence), a coach-builder ; 20. To Dhairya (the divinity of patience), a carpenter (carver) ;‡

21. To Srama (the divinity of labour), the son of a potter ; 22. To Máya (the divinity who delights in art), a blacksmith ; 23. To Rúpa (the divinity of beauty), a jeweller ; 24. To the divinity of prosperity, an agriculturist (sower of seeds, *vapa*) ; 25. To Saravyí (the divinity of arrows), an arrow-maker ; 26. To Hetí (the goddess of arms), a bow-maker ; 27. To Karma (the divinity of art-work), a bowstring-maker ; 28. To Dishta, a maker of

* ब्रह्मणे ब्राह्मणमालभते । चत्राय राजन्यं । मरुद्भ्यो वैश्वं । तपसे शूद्रं । तमसे तस्करं । नारकाय वीरणं । पाप्मने क्लीवं । आक्रयायायोगूं । कामाय पुंस्रलूं । अतिक्रुष्टाय मागधं ॥ १ ॥

† The Vájasaneyi Sañhitá assigns the Síta to Nritta, and the cuckold to Gíta.

‡ गीताय सूतं नृत्ताय शैलूषं । [नृत्ताय सूतं गीताय शैलूषं] धर्माय सभाचरं । नर्माय रेभं । नरिष्ठायै भीमलं । हसाय कारिम् । आनन्दाय स्त्रीषखं । प्रमदे कुमारीपुत्रं । मेधायै रथकारं । धैर्याय तच्चणं ॥ २ ॥

ropes ; 29, to Mrityu, (the divinity of death) a hunter ; 30, to Antaka, (the divinity of murder) a person delighting in hunting with dogs ;*

31, To Sandha, (the divinity of assignation) a person given to adultery ; 32, to Geha, (the divinity of homesteads) one who lives in concubinage ; 33, to Nirriti, (the goddess of misfortune) one who has married before his elder brother ; 34, to Artí, (the goddess of pain) one who wishes to marry before his elder brother ; 35, to Arádhi, (the divinity who causes obstruction to enterprise) one who has married a widow ; 36, to Pavitra, (the divinity of purity) a physician ; 37, to Prajñána, (the divinity of time) an astronomer ; 38, to Niskriti, (the goddess of success) the wife of a goldsmith ; 39, to Bala, (the divinity of strength) a girl who is forcibly taken and kept as a concubine for food and raiment, but no pay ; 40, to Varṇa, (the divinity of colours) one who works for the sake of another, not for himself ;†

41, To the gods of rivers, a fisherman, (Paunjishta) ; 42, to the regents of lonely places, a Naisháda ; 43, to the god who claims to be the noblest of males, an excessively vain man ; 44, to the gods of heroes, an insane man ; 45, to the Gandharvas and their wives, one who has not been duly purified by the initiatory rites (a Vrátya) ; 46, to the regents of snakes, and snake-charmers, one unfit for the initiatory rites ; 47, to the guardian gods, a gambler ; 48, to Iryatá, (the goddess of food) one who abstains from gambling ; 49, to the Pisáchas, a basket-maker ; 50, to the Yátudhánas, (a race of demons) a gardener, or one who puts up a thorny hedge ;‡

51, To those gods who frustrate undertakings, a hunchback ; 52, to Pramada, (the divinity of excessive joy) a dwarf ; 53, to those goddesses who are the guardians of gates, a diseased person ; 54, to the presiding divinity of dreams, a blind man ; 55, to the divinity of sin, a deaf man ; 56, to the divinity of sense, one who wins her husband's affection through charms or filters ; 57, to the divinity of profuse talk, a bore ; 58, to the goddess who is little conversant with the Vedas, a sceptic ; 59, to her who is conversant with them, one who is proficient in questioning ; 60, to her

* अमाय कौलालं । [तपसे कौलालं] । मायायै कार्मरं । रूपाय मणिकारं । शुभे वपं । शरव्याया दुष्कारं । ह्ये धन्वकारं [धनुष्कारं] । कर्मणे ज्याकारं । दिष्टाय रज्जुसर्गं । मृत्यवे मृगयुं । अन्तकाय अनितं ॥ ३ ॥

† सम्बन्धे जारं । गृहायोपपतिं । निर्वृत्तये परिवित्तं । [निर्वृत्तये परिविविदानं] । अर्त्तये परिविविदानं । [अर्त्तये परिवित्तं] । आराधये दिदिष्पतिं । पवित्राय भिषजं । प्रज्ञानाय नक्षत्रदर्शं । निष्कृतये पेशस्कारीं । बलायोपदां । वणायानुबधं ॥ ४ ॥

‡ नदीभ्यः पौञ्जिष्टं । ऋत्नीकाभ्यो नैषादं । पुरुषव्याघ्राय दुर्मदं । प्रयुङ्भ्यः उन्मत्तं । गन्धर्वाप्सुरोभ्यः ब्रात्यं । सर्पदेवजनेभ्यः अप्रतिपदं । अवेभ्यः [अयेभ्यः] कितवं । इर्यताया अकितवं । पिशाचेभ्यो विदलकारं [विदलकारिं] । यातुधानेभ्यः कण्टककारं [कण्टकीकारिं] ॥ ५ ॥

who presides over the purport of the Sástras, one who is able to meet arguments ; *

61, To the divinity of thieves, one proficient in thieving ; 62, to one who prides in killing heroes, a tattler ; 63, to one who presides on gains, a charioteer ; 64, to the divinity who protects royal treasuries, a treasurer or revenue-collector ; 65, to the mighty, a servant ; 66, to the majestic, an officer, or an assistant ; 67, to the dear one, a sweet speaker ; 68, to the uninjurious, a cavalier ; 69, to the intelligent, or him who is proficient in a knowledge of religious rites, a washer-woman ; 70, to the most loving, a female dyer ; †

71, To the refulgent, a collector of fuel ; 72, to the highly refulgent, a fire-man, or lighter of fires ; 73, to him who dwells on the top of heaven, one who officiates at a coronation ; 74, to the regent of the region of the sun, a polisher of metal pots ; 75, to him who prides himself on being of the region of the Devas, one who causes enmity ; 76, to him who resides in the region of the mortals, one who foments quarrels among those who are in peace ; 77, to those who belong to all regions, a peacemaker ; 78, to him who presides over deaths by penance, one who meddles in quarrels ; 79, to him who prides himself on being of heaven (*svarga*), one who collects the dues of a king from his subjects ; 80, to the most aged of heaven, a table-servant ; ‡

81, To the wavy-mover, an elephant-keeper, or máhut ; 82, to the swift, a groom ; 83, to the robust, a cowherd ; 84, to the vigorous, a goat-herd ; 85, to the energetic, a shepherd ; 86, to the divinity of food, a ploughman ; 87, to that of water, a distiller, or vintner ; 88, to that of welfare, a householder ; 89, to that of prosperity, an owner of wealth ; 90, to him who is the immediate cause of all things, the servant of a charioteer, or an assistant charioteer ; §

* उत्सादेभ्यः कुञ्जं । प्रमुदे वामनं । द्वार्यः स्वामं । स्वप्नायाम्बं । अधर्माय बधिरं । सञ्ज्ञानाय स्रकारिं । प्रकामोद्यायोपसदं । आशिक्षायै प्रश्नितं । उपशिक्षाया अभिप्रश्नितं । मर्यादायै प्रश्नविकारं ॥ ६ ॥

† ऋत्यै स्नेहदयं । वैरहत्याय पिशुनं । विविक्तैश्चक्षारं । आपद्रष्टाय सङ्गृहीतारं । [अनुक्षारं] । बलायानुचरं । भूमने परिस्कन्दं । प्रियाय प्रियवादिनं । अरिष्ट्या अश्वसादं । मेधाय वासः पल्लूलो । प्रकामाय रजयित्रीं ॥ ७ ॥

‡ भायै दार्व्याहारं । प्रभाया आग्नेम्बं । नाकस्य पृष्ठायाभिषेक्तारं । ब्रध्नस्य विष्टपाय पात्रनिर्णगं । देवलोकाय पेशितारं । मनुष्यलोकाय प्रकरितारं । सर्वेभ्यो लोकेभ्य उपसेक्तारं । अवन्तैश्च बधायोपमन्थितारं । सुवर्गाय लोकाय भागदुघं । वर्षिष्ठाय नाकाय परिवेष्टारं ॥ ८ ॥

§ अर्म्भेभ्यो हस्तिपं । जवायाश्चपं । पुष्टैर्गोपालं । तेजसेऽजपालं । वीर्यायाविपालं । इरायै कीनाशं । कीलालाय सुराकारं । भद्राय गृहपं । श्रेयसे विक्षपं । अध्यायानुक्षारं ॥ ९ ॥

91, To the mentally wrathful, a blacksmith, or one who works at a forge; 92, to the manifestly angry, one who leads a convict to execution; 93, to him who presides over griefs, a groom who runs before a chariot; 94, to the two who preside over gains above and below one's expectation (*Utkula* and *Vikula*), a cripple who cannot move even with the help of a crutch; 95, to him who presides over expected profits, one who harnesses a horse to a chariot; 96, to him who protects gains, one who unharnesses a horse; 97, to the portly-bodied, the son of one who is addicted to her toilet; 98, to him who presides over politeness, one who puts collyrium on his eyes; 99, to the divinity of sin, a maker of leather sheaths for swords; 100, to Yama, (the destroyer of life) a barren woman;*

101, To Yamí, a mother of twins; 102, to the goddesses who preside over the mantras of the Atharva Veda, a woman who had aborted; 103, to the divinity of the first year of Jupiter's cycle, a woman who is confined long after due time; 104, to that of the second year of ditto, one who has not conceived for the second time; 105, to that of the third year of ditto, one who is able to bring on delivery before due time; 106, to that of the fourth year of ditto, one who can delay delivery; 107, to that of the fifth year of ditto, one who becomes lean without delivery, 108, to one who produces a misleading impression of the world, a woman who appears old in her youth; 109, to the divinity of forests, a forest-ranger or keeper; 110, to the divinity of a side forest, one who protects forests from fires;†

111, To the divinities of lakes, a fisherman who catches fish both in water and also from the bank; 112, to those of ponds one who catches fish with hooks; 113, to those of bays, (or streamless waters near woods,) one who earns his livelihood with a net; 114, to those female divinities who preside over waters amidst prairies, one who earns his livelihood with fishing-hooks; 115, to the divinity of the further bank, a *Kaivarta*, (or one who hunts fish from the banks); 116, to that of the near bank, a *Márgára*, (or one who catches fish with his hands only); 117, to the divinities of fords, one who catches fish by putting up stakes in water; 118, to those who preside over other than fords, one who earns his livelihood by catching fish with nets; 119, to those who preside over sounding waters, one who catches fish by poisoning them

* भन्यवस्थस्तापं । क्रोधाय निसरं । शोकायाभिसरं । उत्कूलविकूलाभ्यां [उत्कूल-
विकूलेभ्यः] त्रिस्थिनं । योगाय योक्तारं । क्षेमाय विमोक्तारं । वपुषे मानस्कृतं । शीला-
याञ्जनीकारं । निर्ऋत्यै कोशकारिणीं । यमायास्त्रम् ॥ १० ॥

† यम्यै यमस्कृतं । अथर्वभ्योऽवतोकां । संवत्सराय पर्यारिणीं । परिवत्सरायाविजा-
तां । इदावत्सरायापस्कद्वरीं । इद्वत्सराया तीवरीं । [इदावत्सरायातीवरीं । इद्वत्सरा-
यातिस्कद्वरीं] । वत्सराय विजर्जरां । संवत्सराय पलिकीं । वनाय वनपं । अन्यतोऽरण्याय
दावपं ॥ ११ ॥

with poisoned leaves placed on the water; 120, to those of caverns in mountains, a Kiráta (or hunter); 121, to those of peaks of mountains, a Yambhaka; 122, to those of mountains, a Kimpurusha;*

123, To the divinity of echoes, a news-dealer; 124, to that of sounds, an incoherent speaker; 125, to that of fading sounds, one who speaks much; 126, to that of unending sound, a dumb person; 127, to that of loud sound, a player on the Víná; 128, to that of musical sounds, a player on the flute; 129, to that of all kinds of sounds, a trumpeter; 130, to that of sounds other than sweet, a blower of conch-shells; 131, to those who preside over the seasons, one whose profession is to collect fragments of skins; 132, to those of statesmanship, (or of time, place and opportunities, for peace negotiations,) a preparer of musical instruments with leather;†

133, To the goddess presiding over abhorrence, a (man of the) Paulkasa (caste); 134, to the goddess of affluence, one who is always careful or wakeful; 135, to that of indigence, a careless or sleepy person; 136, to that of scales (or weighing instruments,) a purchaser; 137, to the god presiding over the radiance of jewels, a goldsmith; 138, to the Visvedevas, a leper; 139, to the divinity of diseases other than leprosy, a naturally lean person; 140, to the goddess of motion, a scandal-monger; 141, to that of prosperity, one who is not impudent; 142, to the god of decay, one who splits wood; (?)‡

143, To the divinity of mirth, a loose woman should be sacrificed; 144, to that of song, a player on the Víná and a songster; 145, to that of aquatic animals, a Sábulyá (one whose body is brindled, or has two colours, a piebald woman); 146, to that of congratulatory words, a woman of perfect form; 147, to that of dancing, one who plays on flutes, one who leads the octave in a chorus, and one who beats time with his hands; 148, to that of manifest delight, one who invites people to a dance, or one who makes a sound to indicate the cessation of a dance; 149, to that of internal de-

* सरोभ्यो घैवरं । वेशन्ताभ्यो दाशं । उपस्थावरीभ्यो वैन्दं । [वैशन्ताभ्यो वैन्दं । उपस्थावराभ्यो दाशं ।] नड्बलाभ्यः शौष्कलं । पार्याय कैवर्त्तं । अवार्याय मार्गारं । [पाराय मार्गारं । आवाराय कैवर्त्तं] । तीर्थेभ्य आन्दं । विषमेभ्यो मैनालं । स्वनेभ्यः पर्णकं । गुहाभ्यः किरातं । सानुभ्यो जम्भकं । पर्वतेभ्यः किम्पूरुषं ॥ १२ ॥

† प्रतिश्रुत्काया ऋतुलं । घोषाय भषं । अन्ताय बड्वादिनं । अनन्ताय मूकं । महसे वीणावादं । क्रामाय तूणवध्मं । आक्रन्दाय दुन्दुभ्याघातं । अवरस्वराय शड्धुधं । ऋभुभ्योऽजिनसन्धायं । साध्येभ्यश्चर्माम्याम् ॥ १३ ॥

‡ वीभत्सायै पौल्कसम् । भूत्यै जागरणम् । अभूत्यै स्वपनम् । तुलायै वाणिजम् । वर्णाय हिरण्यकारम् । विश्वेभ्यो देवेभ्यः सिध्मलम् । पश्चाद्दोषाय श्लीवम् [श्लाविनं] । ऋत्यै जनवादिनम् । बृद्ध्या अपगल्मम् । सङ्गराय प्रच्छिदम् ॥ १४ ॥

light, one who plays on the *talava* (a musical instrument, probably the archetype of the modern *tablá*), or one who produces music from his mouth ;*

150, To the divinity of gambling with the dice, a proficient gambler ; 151, to that of the Kríta age, a keeper of a gambling hall ; 152, to that of the Tretá age, a marker or reckoner at a gambling table ; 153, to that of the Dvápára age, one who is a spectator at a gambling ; 154, to that of the Kali age, one who does not leave a gambling hall even after the play has stopped ; 155, to that of difficult enterprises, a teacher of gymnastics on the top of a bamboo ; 156, to that of roads, a Brahmachári ; 157, to the Pisáchas, one who commits robberies on public highways and then hides himself in a mountain ; 158, to the goddess of thirst, one who skins cattle ; 159, to that of sin, a cattle-poisoner ; 160, to that of hunger, a cow-butcher ; 161, to the goddesses of hunger and thirst, one who lives by begging beef from a butcher ;†

162, To the divinity of land, a cripple who moves about on a crutch ; 163, to that of fire, a Chaṇḍála ; 164, to that of the sky, one whose profession is to dance on the top of a bamboo ; 165, to that of the celestial region, a bald person ; 166, to the presiding divinity of the sun, a green-eyed person ; 167, to the presiding divinity of the moon, one who twinkles his eyes too frequently ; 168, to the presiding divinity of the stars, one affected with white leprous blotches ; 169, to that of day, an albino with tawny eyes ; 170, to that of night, a black person with tawny eyes ;‡

171, To the goddess of speech, a fat person ; 172, to Váyu, the five vital airs : prána, apána, vyána, udána and samána, of that person ; 173, to Súrya should be immolated his eyes ; 174, to Chandramá his mind ; 175, to the regents of the quarters, his ears ; 176, his life, to Prajápati.§

* हसाय पु० शूलमालभते । वीणावादं गणकं गीताय । यादसे शाबुल्यां । नर्माय भद्रवतीम् । वृणवध्मं ग्रामण्यं पाणिसङ्घातं नृत्ताय । मोदायानुक्रोशकम् । आनन्दाय तलवं ॥ १५ ॥

† अक्षराजाय कितवम् । कृताय सभाविनम् । [कृतायाद्दिनवदशं] । चैताया आदिनवदशं [कल्पिनं] । द्वापराय वह्निःसदं । [अधिकल्पिनं] । कलये सभास्याणम् । दुष्कृताय चरकाचार्य्यं । अध्वने ब्रह्मचारिणं । पिशाचेभ्यः शैलम् । पिपासायै गोव्यच्छं । निर्वर्त्यै गोघातं । क्षुधे गोविकर्त्तारम् । [योगां] । क्षुत्तृष्णाभ्यां तम् । यो गां विकृतं तं मा० सं भिक्षमाण उपतिष्ठते ॥ १६ ॥

‡ भूम्यै पीठसर्पिणमालभते । अग्नये अ० सलम् । वायवे चाण्डालम् । अन्तरिक्षाय व० शनर्त्तिनम् । दिवे खलतिम् । सूर्याय ह्य्यक्षम् । चन्द्रमसे मिर्मिरं । नक्षत्रेभ्यः किलासम् । अक्ने शुक्लं पिङ्गलम् । रात्रियै कृष्णं पिङ्गाक्षम् ॥ १७ ॥

§ वाचे पुरुषमालभते । प्राणमपानं व्यानमुदानं समानं तान् वायवे । सूर्याय चक्षुरालभते । मनसुन्द्रमसे । दिग्भ्यः श्रोत्रं । प्रजापतये पुरुषम् ॥ १८ ॥

177, Now to ugly divinities should be immolated very short, very tall, very lean, very fat, very white, very dark, very smooth, very hairy, few-toothed, numerously-toothed, frequently-twinkling-eyed, and very glaring-eyed, persons; 178, to the goddess for unattainable objects of hope, a woman who has passed the age for conception; 179, (and) to the goddess of hope for attainable objects, a virgin.”*

In explanation of the purport of this long passage in the Taittiríya Bráhmaṇa, Apastamba says: “The Purushamedha is pentadiurnal; a Bráhmaṇa or a Rájanya (Kshatriya) should celebrate it. He thereby acquires strength and vigour; he enjoys all fruition. (The number of) days should be as in the Panchasáradiya rite, and as a sequel to the Agnishtoma rite, eleven animals, meet for the Agnisomiya, should be tethered to eleven sacrificial posts, and, three oblations to Sávitri having been offered with the mantra *Deva savitastat savitur visváni deva savita &c.*, on the middle day they should be sacrificed (or consecrated *upákrita*). Having sacrificed twice eleven men, reciting the mantra *Brahmané Bráhmaṇán álabheta*, (the priest) places the sacrificed (or consecrated, *upákrita*) victims between the sacrificial posts. The Brahmá (priest), then placing himself on the south side, recites the hymn to the great male Naráyana beginning with the verse *sahasra sírsa purusha, &c.*, and, then turning a burning brand round the victims, consigns them to the north; (the other priests), then offering an oblation with clarified butter to the presiding divinity, place them (there).”†

Sáyana Achárya, after quoting this opinion of Apastamba, and explaining the different terms used in the Bráhmaṇa to indicate the different gods and goddesses and the persons deemed meet for them, adds, “the human-formed animals beginning with Bráhmaṇa and ending with Virgin, are immolated (*álabdhavyáh*) along with the sacrificial animals on the middle day of the five days of this Purushamedha, which is a kind of Somayága.”‡

* अथैतानऽरूपेभ्यः आलभते । अतिरूक्षमतिदीर्घं । अतिकृशमत्यसलम् । अतिशुक्लमतिकृष्णम् । अतिश्लक्ष्णमतिलोमशम् । अतिकिरिटमतिदन्तरम् । अतिभिर्भिरमतिमेनिषम् । आशायै जामिम् । प्रतीचायै कुमारीम् ॥ १९ ॥

† तत्रापस्तम्ब आह । पञ्चाहः पुरुषमेधे ब्राह्मणे राजन्यो वा यजेत । आजो वीर्यमाप्नोति, सर्वाव्युष्टीर्यश्रुतः । एकादशसु यूपेष्वेकादशाग्नीषोमीयाः । पञ्चशारदीयवदहान्यग्निष्टोमो वोपोत्तमो देवसवितस्तत् सवितुर्विश्वानि देवसवितरिति तिस्रः सावित्रीर्जला मध्यमेऽहनि पशूनुपाकरोति । द्वयानैकादशिनानुपाकृत्य पुरुषान् ब्रह्मणे ब्राह्मणमालभेत इत्येतद् यथासमाम्नातं तान्यूपान्तराले धारयन्त्युपाकृतान् । दक्षिणतोऽवस्थाय ब्रह्मा सहस्रशीर्षाः पुरुष इति पुरुषेण नारायणेन पराचानुशंसति । पर्यग्निकृतानुदीचीनान् प्रोत्सृजत्याज्येन तद्देवता आहुतीर्जला द्वयैरेकादशीनान् संस्थापयन्तीति ।

‡ ब्राह्मणादयः कुमार्यन्ताः प्रोक्ता मनुष्यविशेषरूपाः पशवोऽस्मिन् पुरुषमेधे पञ्चाह सोमयागविशेषे मध्यमेऽहनि सवनीयपशुभिः समचित्यालम्बयाः ।

Neither Ápastambha nor Sáyaṇa has a word to say about the human victims being symbolical. The word used by Ápastambha is *Upákṛita*, which may mean consecration before a sacrifice or slaughter; and according to Jaimini, the highest authority on sacrifices, and his commentator Savara Svámí, the sacrificial operations “of consecration, of bringing the animal to the place of sacrifice, fettering it, tying it to the post, slaughtering, and cutting the carcass open for the distribution of the flesh among the priests, are all implied when sacrifice is meant,” and the latter adds that “all the different acts should be understood when sacrifices are ordained, except when special instructions are given.”* Now no special exception has been made in the text about the human victims, and consequently the only conclusion to be arrived at is—that, the Taittiríyas did not look upon the rite as symbolical, though in the case of sacrifices under Nos. 172 to 176, the actual slaughtering of the airs, &c., would be rather awkward. It must be added, however, that Ápastambha is very brief and obscure in his remarks, and it would be hazardous to draw a positive conclusion from the insufficient data supplied by him, particularly as the Śatapatha Bráhmaṇa is positive on the subject of the human victims being let off after consecration; though the fact of that Bráhmaṇa being much later than the Taittiríya Bráhmaṇa, may justify the assumption that the practice of the Kánva school can be no guide to the followers of the Taittiríyaka.

The Śatapatha refers to the Purushamedha in several places; and the following is the full description of the rite given in it:

1. “Verily the great male, Náráyaṇa, willed: ‘I shall abide over all living beings; verily I shall become all this (creation).’ He perceived this penta-diurnal sacrificial rite Purushamedha. He collected it. With it he performed a sacrifice. Performing a sacrifice with it, he abided over all living beings, and became all this (creation). He abides over all living beings and becomes all this, who performs a Purushamedha, as also he who knows all this.†

2. “Of that rite there are twenty-three initiations (*dikshá*), twelve benefactions (*upasada*), and five lustrations (*sutyá*), making altogether forty

* उपाकरणम् उपानयनम् अक्षयाबन्धो, यूपे नियोजनम् सञ्चपनम् विशसनम् इत्येवमादयः । + + + + सवनीयस्य एते धर्माः भवेयुः । तुल्यः सर्वेषां पशुविधिः स्यात् । यदि प्रकरणे विशेषो न भवेत् । *Mimánsá Darsana* p. 373.

† पुरुषो ह नारायणोऽकामयत । अनितिष्ठेयं सर्वाणि भूतान्यहमेवेदं सर्वं स्यामिति । स एतं पुरुषमेधं पञ्चरात्रं यज्ञक्रतुमपश्यत्तमाहरत्तेनायजत तेनेष्ट्यात्यतिष्ठत् सर्वाणि भूतानीदं सर्वमभवदतितिष्ठति सर्वाणि भूतानीदं सर्वं भवति य एवं विद्वान् पुरुषमेधेन यजते यो वैतदेवं वेद ॥ १ ॥

members (*gátra*). The forty comprising the initiations, benefactions, &c., constitute the forty-syllabled *virát*, (a form of metre) which assumes the form of *Virát* (the first male produced by *Prajápati*, and the father of mankind). Thus it is said; ‘*Virát*, the first or superior male, was produced.’* This is the same *Virát*. From this *Virát* is produced the male for sacrifice.†

3. “Thereof these. There are four *Daśats*, and since there are four *Daśats*, they are the means for the attainment of the (different) regions and quarters (of the universe). This region (the earth) is the first to be attained by a *Daśat*; the upper region the second; the sky the third; the quarters the fourth. Thus verily the institutor of the sacrifice attains this region through the first *Daśat*, the region of ether through the second, the celestial region through the third, and the quarters through the fourth. Thus the *Purushamedha* is the means of attaining and subjugating all this—all these regions and all the quarters.‡

4. “For the initiation of this ceremony eleven animals meet for *Agni* and *Soma*, (should be procured). For them there should be eleven sacrificial posts (*Yúpa*). Eleven syllables are comprised in the *Trisṭup* metre; the *Trisṭup* is the thunderbolt,—it is vigour. With the thunderbolt and vigour of the *Trisṭup* the institutor of the sacrifice destroys all the sin before him.§

5. “In the rite of lustration there should be eleven victims. Eleven syllables are comprised in the *Trisṭup* metre; the *Trisṭup* is the thunderbolt,—it is vigour. With the thunderbolt and vigour of the *Trisṭup* the institutor of the sacrifice (*Yajamána*) destroys the sin before him.||

6. “Because the victims (in this sacrifice) are eleven-fold, therefore verily is all this (creation) elevenfold. *Prajápati* is eleven-fold; all this is

* A quotation from the *Purushasukta* as given in the *Vájasaneyi Sañhitá*.

† तस्य त्रयोविंशतिर्दीक्षाः द्वादशोपसदः पञ्च सुत्याः स एष चत्वारिंशद्गात्रः सदी-
क्षोपसत्कश्चत्वारिंशदक्षरा विराट् तद्विराजमभिसम्पद्यते ततो विराडजायत विराजोऽ
अधि पुरुष इत्येषा वै सा विराडेतस्या एवैतद्विराजो यज्ञं पुरुषं जनयति ॥ २ ॥

‡ ता वाऽ एताः । चतस्रो दशतो भवन्ति तद्यदेताश्चतस्रो दशतो भवन्त्येषां चैव
लोकानामाग्नेः दिशां चेममेव लोकं प्रथमया दशतान्नुवन्नन्तरि च द्वितीयया दिवं तृतीयया
दिशश्चतुर्थ्या तथैवैतद् यजमान इममेव लोकं प्रथमया दशतान्नेत्यन्तरि च द्वितीयया दिवं
तृतीयया दिशश्चतुर्थ्यतावद्वाऽ इदं सर्वं यावदिमे च लोका दिशश्च सर्वं पुरुषमेधः
सर्वस्याग्नेः सर्वस्यावरुद्धैः ॥ ३ ॥

§ एकादशाग्निषोमीयाः पशव उपवसथे । तेषां समानं कर्मकादश यूपा एकादशा-
क्षरा त्रिष्टुब्बत्रिष्टुब्बीर्यं त्रिष्टुब्बत्रेणैवैतत् वीर्येण यजमानः पुरस्तात् पाप्मानमपहते ॥ ४ ॥

|| एकादशभिनाः सुत्यासु पशवो भवन्ति । एकादशाक्षरा त्रिष्टुब् वत्रिष्टुब् वीर्यं
त्रिष्टुब् वत्रेणैवैतद् वीर्येण यजमानः पुरस्तात् पाप्मानमपहते ॥ ५ ॥

verily Prajápati ; all this is the Purushamedha, which is the means for the attainment and subjugation of all this.*

7. “That Purushamedha is verily penta-diurnal, and the greatest rite of sacrifice. Fivefold is Yajña ; fivefold are victims or sacrificial animals ; five are the seasons included in the year. Whatever is fivefold in celestial or spiritual matter, the same may be obtained through this (rite).†

8. “Thereof the Agnishtoma is the first day ; next the Ukthya ; the next Atirátra ; the next Ukthya ; the next Agnishtoma : thus it is hedged on either side with the Ukthya and the Agnishtoma.‡

9. “Yavamadhya are these five nights, (that is like a barley corn stoutest in the middle and tapering on either side, meaning that the most important day is in the middle ; or, as the commentator has it, the penance of gradually reducing the food and then again gradually increasing it, should be observed, so that on the third night there should be the smallest allowance of food). These regions are verily the Purushamedha ; these regions have light on either side,—Agni on this (side), and the sun on the other (side). In the same way it (the Purushamedha) has, on either side, the food of light and the Ukthya. The soul is Atirátra ; and since the Atirátra is hedged in on both sides with the two Ukthyas, therefore is the soul nourished by food. And since the thriving Atirátra, is placed in the middle day, therefore is it Yavamadhya. He who engages in this rite has none to envy him, or to grow inimical to him. He who knows this suffers not from envy or enmity.§

10. “Of that Purushamedha this region is the first day. Of this region the spring season (is the chief). That which is above this region, the etherial region, (*antariksha*,) is the second day ; of that the summer is the season. The etherial region is its third day. Of the etherial region the rainy and the autumn are the seasons. That which is above the etherial region, the sky, (*Diva*,) is the fourth day ; of it the dewy is the season. The heaven is its

* यद्वैकादशिना भवन्ति । एकादशिनी वाऽ इदं सर्वं प्रजापतिर्ह्यैकादशिनी सर्वं हि प्रजापतिः सर्वं पुरुषमेधः सर्वस्याग्नौ सर्वस्यावरुद्धौ ॥ ६ ॥

† स वाऽ एष पुरुषमेधः पञ्चरात्रो यज्ञक्रतुर्भवति । पाङ्क्तो यज्ञः पाङ्क्तः पशुः पञ्चर्तवः संवत्सरो यत्किञ्च पञ्चविधमधिदेवतमध्यात्मं तदेनेन सर्वमाप्नोति ॥ ७ ॥

‡ तस्याग्निष्टोमः प्रथममहर्भवति । अथोक्थेऽथातिरात्रोऽथोक्थेऽथाग्निष्टोमः स वाऽ एष उभयतोऽज्योतिरुभयतउक्थः ॥ ८ ॥

§ यवमध्यः पञ्चरात्रो भवति । इमे वै लोकाः पुरुषमेध उभयतोऽज्योतिषो वाऽ इम लोका अग्निनेत आदित्येनामुतसस्मादुभयतोऽज्योतिरन्नमुक्थ आत्मातिरात्रस्तद् यदेताऽ उक्थग्रावतिरात्रमभितो भवतस्समाद्यमात्मानेन परिवृढोऽथ यदेष वर्षिष्ठोऽतिरात्रोऽङ्गां स मध्ये तस्माद्यवमधो युते ह वै द्विषन्तं भ्रातृव्यमयमेवास्ति नास्य द्विषन भ्रातृव्य इत्याहुर्न एव वेद ॥ ९ ॥

fifth day ; of that heaven the winter is the season. This much is the celestial account of the Purushamedha.*

11. "Now for its spiritual relations. Initiation (*Pratishthá*) is its first day. Initiation is the spring season. That which is above it and below the middle is the second day ; of that the summer is the season. The middle is the middle day. Of the middle day the rainy and the autumn are the seasons. That which is above the middle day and below the head or last day is the fourth day ; thereof the dewy is the reason. That which is the head is the fifth day ; the season of this head is the winter. Thus verily these regions, the year, and the soul constitute the Purushamedha. All these regions, the whole year, the whole soul, the whole Purushamedha are for the attainment and subjugation of every thing.†

(Section 2.) 1. Now, whence the name Purushamedha ? These regions verily are *Pur*, and He, the Purusha, who sanctifies this (*Pur*) sleeps (*sete*) in this abode (*Puri*) and hence is he named Purusha (*Puri* and *sete* = Purusha). To him belongs whatever food exists in these regions ; that food is (called) *medha* ; and since his food is *medha*, therefore is this Purushamedha. Now since in this (rite) purified males are sacrificed (*álabhate*), therefore verily is this a Purushamedha.‡

2. These (males) verily are sacrificed (*álabhate*) on the middle day. The etherial region is the middle day ; the etherial region is verily the abiding place of all living beings. These animals are verily food ; the middle day is the belly, and in that belly is that food deposited.§

* तस्याथमेव लोकः प्रथममहः । अथमस्य लोको वसन्त ऋतुर्यदूर्द्धमस्मालोकाद्वाचीनमन्तरिक्षात् द्वितीयमहस्तदस्य ग्रीष्म ऋतुरन्तरिक्षमेवास्य मध्यममहरन्तरिक्षमस्य वर्षाशरदाष्टू यदूर्द्धमन्तरिक्षाद्वाचीनं दिवस्तच्चतुर्थमहस्तदस्य हेमन्त ऋतुर्वायुस्य पञ्चममहर्वायुस्य शिशिर ऋतुरित्यग्निदेवतं ॥ १० ॥

† अथाध्यात्मं । प्रतिष्ठैवास्य प्रथममहः प्रतिष्ठोऽस्य वसन्त ऋतुर्यदूर्द्धं प्रतिष्ठाया अवाचीनं मध्यात् द्वितीयमहस्तदस्य ग्रीष्म ऋतुर्मध्यमेवास्य मध्यममहर्मध्यमस्य वर्षाशरदाष्टू यदूर्द्धं मध्याद्वाचीनं ग्रीष्मस्तच्चतुर्थमहस्तदस्य हेमन्त ऋतुः शिर एवास्य पञ्चममहः शिरोऽस्य शिशिर ऋतुरेवमिमे च लोकाः संवत्सरश्चात्मा च पुरुषमेधमभिसम्पद्यन्ते सर्वं वाऽ इमे लोकाः सर्वं संवत्सरः सर्वमात्मा सर्वं पुरुषमेधः सर्वस्यात्प्रैः सर्वस्यावरुद्धैः ॥ १ ॥
ब्राह्मणं ॥ [६. १.] ॥ ॥

‡ अथ यस्मात् पुरुषमेधो नाम । इमे वै लोकाः पूरयमेव पुरुषो योऽयं पवते सोऽस्यां पुरि श्रुते तस्मात् पुरुषस्तस्य यदेषु लोकेष्वन्नं तदस्यान्नं मेधस्तद्यदस्यैतदन्नं मेधस्तस्मात् पुरुषमेधोऽथो यदस्मिन् मेध्यान् पुरुषानालभते तस्माद्देव पुरुषमेधः ॥ १ ॥

§ तान् वै मध्यमेऽहन्नालभते । अन्तरिक्षं वै मध्यममहरन्तरिक्षमु वै सर्वेषां भूतानामायतनमथोऽन्नं वाऽ एते पशव उदरं मध्यममहरुदरे तदन्नं दधाति ॥ २ ॥

3. They are sacrificed by ten and ten. Ten syllables are comprised in (each foot of) the Virát, (metre); the Virát is complete food, for the attainment of complete food.*

4. Eleven tens are sacrificed. Eleven syllables are comprised in the Trishtup (metre); the Trishtup is the thunderbolt,—it is vigour. With the thunderbolt and vigour of the Trishtup, the institutor of the sacrifice destroys the sin within him (lit. in the middle).†

5. “Forty-eight (animals) are sacrificed at the middle post. Forty-eight syllables are comprised in the Jagati (metre); the animals belong to the Jagati (metre); by the Jagati are animals bestowed on the Yajamána.‡

6. “Eleven eleven at the other (posts). Eleven syllables are comprised in the Trishtup; the Trishtup is the thunderbolt,—it is vigour. With the thunderbolt and vigour of the Trishtup should the institutor of the sacrifice destroy the sin around him.§

7. “Eight best ones are sacrificed. Eight syllables are comprised in the Gáyatrí (metre). The Gáyatrí is Brahma. That Brahma consummates the well-being of all this. Therefore is Brahma said to be the best of all this.||

8. “They (the sacrificial animals) belong to Prajápáti. Brahma is Prajápáti; Prajápáti belongs to Brahma; therefore do they (the animals) belong to Prajápáti.¶

9. “He (Prajápáti, *i. e.* Brahma, here meaning the priest so named) having sanctified the animals, offers, for the gratification of Sávítá, three oblations with the Sávitrí verses beginning with, *Deva savitus tatsavitur*, &c. He (Sávítá), gratified thereby, produces these men, therefore are these men sacrificed.**

* तान् वै दश दशालभते । दशाक्षरा विराड्विराड् कृत्स्नमन्नं कृत्स्नस्यैवान्नायस्या-
वरुद्धैः ॥ ३ ॥

† एकादश दशत आलभते । एकादशाक्षरा त्रिष्टुब् वज्रस्त्रिष्टुब् वीर्यं त्रिष्टुब् वज्रे-
णैवैतद् वीर्येण यजमानो मध्यतः पाप्मानमपहते ॥ ४ ॥

‡ अष्टाचत्वारिंशत्तं मध्यमे यूपऽ आलभते । अष्टाचत्वारिंशदक्षरा जगती जागताः
पशवो जगत्यैवास्मै पशून्वरुद्धे ॥ ५ ॥

§ एकादशैकादशेतरेषु । एकादशाक्षरा त्रिष्टुब् वज्रस्त्रिष्टुब् वीर्यं त्रिष्टुब् वज्रेणैवैतद्
वीर्येण यजमानोऽभितः पाप्मानमपहते ॥ ६ ॥

|| अष्टाऽ उत्तमानालभते । अष्टाक्षरा गायत्री ब्रह्मगायत्री तद् ब्रह्मैवैतदस्य सर्वस्योत्तमं
करोति तस्माद् ब्रह्मास्य सर्वस्योत्तममित्याहुः ॥ ७ ॥

¶ ते वै प्राजापत्या भवन्ति । ब्रह्म वै प्राजापतिर्ब्राह्मो हि प्राजापतिस्त्वात् प्राजापत्या
भवन्ति ॥ ८ ॥

** स वै पशून्नुपाकरिष्यन् । एतास्त्रिभ्यः सावित्रीराजतीर्जुहोति देव सवितस्त्ववितु-
र्वरेणं विश्वानि देव सवितरिति तवितारं प्रीणाति सोऽस्मै प्रीत एतान् पुरुषान् प्रसौति तेन
प्रसूतानालभते ॥ ९ ॥

10. "A Bráhmana is sacrificed to Brahma.* Brahma is verily Bráhmana; Brahma thrives through Bráhmana. To the Kshatriya (divinity) a (person of the) Rájanya (caste), (should be sacrificed). The Kshatriya is verily Rájanya. The Kshatra thrives through a Kshatra. To the Maruts a Vaiśya (should be sacrificed). The Viśa is the Maruts. The Viśas thrive through the Viśas. To Tapas (the presiding divinity of penances), a Súdra (should be sacrificed). Tapas is verily Súdra. Tapas thrives through Tapases (works of penance). Even as these gods thrive through these animals (victims), so do they, thriving, cause the institutor of the sacrifice to thrive in all his wishes.†

11. "Offers oblation with butter. The butter is verily vigour. Through that vigour, vigour is given to this (institutor of the sacrifice). Offerings are given with butter, which is the gods' most favourite glory; and since butter promotes their favourite glory, they, thriving, cause the institutor of the sacrifice to thrive in all his wishes.‡

12. "The persons appointed. The Brahmá, from the south, praises the great male Náráyana, with the sixteen Rig verses beginning with *Sahasraśírsha* &c. (the Purushasukta), for verily the whole of the Purushamedha is sixteen membered for the attainment of everything, and for the subjugation of everything; and he is praised with the words, "thus thou art, thus thou art." In this way he is worshipped for certain. Now, as it is, this is said about it, the animals are consecrated by turning a flaming brand round them, but left unslaughtered," (*asañjñaptáh*)§ [Kátyáyana explains that the Bráhmanas &c., are let loose, like the *Kapiñjala* bird in the Ásvamedha sacrifice.—*Kapinjáládi-vadutsrijanti Bráhmanádín*; and his commentator adds, "after a flaming brand has been turned round them:" *paryagnikritanutsrijantityarthah.*]

* A quotation from the Sañhitá.

† ब्रह्मणे ब्राह्मणमालभते । ब्रह्म वै ब्राह्मणे ब्रह्मैव तद्ब्रह्मणा समर्धयति चत्राय राजन्यं चत्रं वै राजन्यः चत्रमेव तत् चत्रेण समर्धयति मरुद्भ्या वैश्यं विशो वै मरुतो विशमेव तद्विशा समर्धयति तपसे शूद्रं तपो वै शूद्रस्तप एव तत्तपसा समर्धयत्येवमेता देवता यथारूपं पशुभिः समर्धयति ता एनं समृद्धाः समर्धयन्ति सर्वैः कामैः ॥ १० ॥

‡ आज्येन जुहोति । तेजो वाऽआज्यं तेजसैवास्मिंस्ततेजो दधात्याज्येन जुहोत्येतद्वै देवानां प्रियं धाम यदाज्यं प्रियेणैवैनां धाम्ना समर्धयति तऽएनं समृद्धाः समर्धयन्ति सर्वैः कामैः ॥ ११ ॥

§ नियुक्तान् पुरुषान् । ब्रह्मा दक्षिणतः पुरुषेण नारायणेनाभिष्टौति सहस्रशीर्षा पुरुषः सहस्राक्षः सहस्रपादित्येतेन षोडशर्चेन षोडशकलं वाऽइदं सर्वं सर्वं पुरुषमेधः सर्वस्याग्नौ सर्वस्यावरुद्धाऽइत्यमसीत्यमसीत्युपस्तौत्येवैनमेतन् महयत्येवाथो यथैष तथैनमेतदाह तत्पर्यग्निक्रताः पशवा बभूवुरसञ्ज्ञताः ॥ १२ ॥

13. "About this ; speech (*vák*) uttered this ; 'O male, grieve not if you remain here ; a male will eat a male.' Thus, those who had the flaming brand turned round them, were let loose, oblations of butter were offered to the several divinities ; and thereby were the divinities gratified ; and thus gratified they conferred all blessings on the worshipper."* [Three oblations are offered to each of the divinities, naming each, and followed by the word *sváhá*].

14. "He offers oblations with butter. Butter is vigour ; by that vigour verily vigour abides in this (worshipper, *Yajamána*).†

15. "(This rite) is established (for the worshipper, *Yajamána*) by the eleven (animals). Eleven-syllabled is the *Trishtup*. The *Trishtup* is the thunderbolt,—it is vigour. Through the thunderbolt and vigour of the *Trishtup*, the *Yajamána* destroys the sin within him.‡

16. "Abiding in the ceremony of *Udayaniyá*." (Vide *Ásvaláyana Sútra* IV, 3. *Kátyáyana* VII, 1, 16.) "Eleven barren cows, such as are meet for *Mitra*, *Varuṇa* the *Viśvedevas*, and *Brihaspati* should be sacrificed (*álabhate*) for the attainment of these deities, and since those for *Brihaspati* are the last, *Brihaspati* is the same with *Brahma*, and therefore the *Yajamána* ultimately abides in *Brahma*."§ [Kátyáyana explains that three cows are to be slaughtered to *Mitra* and *Varuṇa*, three to the *Viśvedevás*, and five to *Brihaspati*].

17. "Now why are there eleven ? Eleven-syllabled is the *Trishtup*. The *Trishtup* is the thunderbolt,—it is vigour. By the thunderbolt and vigour of the *Trishtup*, the *Yajamána* destroys the sin within him. Threefold is the ceremony of *Udavasániya* ; "(*Aitareya Bráhmaṇa* 8, 8,)" it is a friend of the *Yajamána*.||

18. "Now for the fees (*dakshiná*). (Wealth acquired) from [a conquered] country, excluding land, and wealth taken from *Bráhmaṇas*, but including men (slaves). (Wealth from) the eastern side (of the king-

* अथ हैनं वागभ्युवाद । पुरुष मा सन्निष्ठिपो यदि संस्थापयिष्यसि पुरुष एव पुरुष-
मत्स्यतीति तान् पर्यग्निकृतानेवोदहृजत्तद्देवत्या आज्ञतीरजुहोताभिस्ता देवता अप्रीणात्ता
एनं प्रीता अप्रीणन्त सर्वैः कामैः ॥ १३ ॥

† आज्येन जुहोति । तेजो वाऽ आज्यं तेजसेवास्मिन्तेजो दधाति ॥ १४ ॥

‡ एकादशिनैः संस्थापयति । एकादशाक्षरा त्रिष्टुब् वज्रस्त्रिष्टुब् वीर्यं त्रिष्टुब् वज्रेणै-
वैतद्वीर्येण यजमानो मध्यतः पाप्मानमपहते ॥ १५ ॥

§ उदयनीयायां संस्थितायां । एकादश वशा अनुबन्ध्या आलभते मैत्रावरुणीवैश्व-
देवीर्वार्हस्यत्या एतासां देवतानामाप्तौ तद्यद्वार्हस्यत्या अन्या भवन्ति ब्रह्म वै दृहस्यतिस्तदु
ब्रह्मण्येवान्ततः प्रतितिष्ठति ॥ १६ ॥

|| अथ यदेकादश भवन्ति एकादशाक्षरा त्रिष्टुब् वज्रस्त्रिष्टुब् वीर्यं त्रिष्टुब् वज्रेणैवैत-
द्वीर्येण यजमानो मध्यतः पाप्मानमपहते त्रैधातव्युदवसानीयासावेव बन्धुः ॥ १७ ॥

dom), along with slaves (should be given) to the Hotá (or reciter of Rig mantras). (Wealth from) the southern side (with slaves) to the Bráhmaṇa, (the director); (wealth from) the western side (with slaves) to the Adhvaryu (Yajur Vedic priest); (wealth from) the northern side (with slaves) to the Udgátá (or singer of the Sáma hymns), and according to their dues to the Hotrikas, (or junior priests).”*

[This verse is very elliptical and obscure, and translating without the aid of a commentary, I am doubtful about its exact construction. The ellipses have been supplied from the Sútras of Kátyáyana.]

19. “Now if a Bráhmaṇa performs the ceremony he should give (all his property) to the most learned. The Bráhmaṇa includes everything; the knower of every thing is included in everything; the Purushamedha includes everything, (and it is) for the attainment and subjugation of everything.†

20. “Now, keeping to himself only his own self, and his (household) fire, and after praising the sun with the Uttara Náráyana hymn, looking at nothing, he should retire to a forest; thereby he separates himself from mankind. If he should like to dwell in a village, he should produce a fire by the rubbing of two sticks, and, praising Aditya with the Uttara Náráyana hymn, return home, and there continue to perform the rites he was used to, and which he is able to perform. He verily should not speak with every body; to him the Purushamedha is everything, and therefore he should not speak to all (kinds of persons); to those only whom he knows, who are learned, and who are dear to him he may speak; but not to all.”‡

No one, I fancy, will deny that the sacrifice described above clearly shows that it is a modification of a prior rite in which the human victims wholly or in part were immolated. No other theory can satisfactorily account for its peculiar character, and the way in which it justifies itself. Probably the number originally sacrificed was few, and that when the rite became emblematic, the number was increased in confirmation of some liturgical theory, particularly as it did not involve any trouble or difficulty.

* अथातो दक्षिणानां । मध्यं प्रति राष्ट्रस्य यदन्यद्भूमेश्च ब्राह्मणस्य च वित्तात् सपुरुषं प्राची दिग्घोतुर्दक्षिणा ब्रह्मणः प्रतीचध्वर्योरुदीच्युद्गतुस्तदेव होतृका अन्वाभक्ताः ॥ १८ ॥

† अथ यदि ब्राह्मणो यजेत । सर्व्ववेदसं दद्यात् सर्व्वं वै ब्राह्मणः सर्व्वं सर्व्ववेदसं सर्व्वं पुरुषमेधः सर्व्वस्याप्तौ सर्व्वस्यावरुद्धौ ॥ १९ ॥

‡ अथात्मन्नग्री समारोह्य । उत्तरनारायणेनादित्यमुपस्थायानपेक्षमाणोऽरण्यमभिप्रेयात् तदेव मनुष्येभ्यस्तिरो भवति यद्यु ग्रामे विवत्सेदरण्योरग्री समारोह्योत्तरनारायणेणैवादित्यमुपस्थाय गृहेषु प्रत्यवस्येद्य तान् यज्ञक्रतूनाहरेत यानभ्याम्नुयात् स वाऽएष न सर्व्वस्माऽअनुवक्तव्यः सर्व्वं हि पुरुषमेधो नेत्सर्व्वस्माऽइव सर्व्वं ब्रवाणीति यो न्वेव ज्ञातस्तस्मै ब्रूयाद्य योऽनूचानोऽथ योऽस्य प्रियः स्यान्नेत्सेव सर्व्वस्माऽइव ॥ २० ॥ ब्राह्मणम् । २॥ [६. २.] ॥ षष्ठोऽध्यायः [८६.] ॥

But whether so or not, certain it is that at one time or other men were immolated for the gratification of some divinity or other in this rite or its prototype. The question then arises, was it the case before the date of the Rik Sañhitá, or after it?

The interval between the date of the Śatapatha Bráhmaṇa and the Sañhitá of the Rig Veda is estimated by the learned Professor Max Müller at about six and seven hundred years, and the question being, when was the sacrifice real which became emblematic in the time of the Śatapatha? it would require more confidence in one's power of conjecture than I can pretend to, to say that it must have been before the time of the Sañhitá, and not after it. National rites, customs, and ceremonies are, doubtless, very tenacious of life, but in primitive times, in the infancy and early youth of society, the characteristics of social life changed much more rapidly than in later times; certain it is, that the social condition of the Indo-Aryans and their rites and ceremonies underwent radical and most extensive changes during the interval between the Rik Sañhitá and the Śatapatha Bráhmaṇa, and there is literally not an iota of evidence to show that the rite of Purushamedha was left unaltered for the whole period. Seeing that the Bráhmaṇa depends solely on the Sañhitá for scriptural authority, and adapts the, to us, indistinct and vague generalities of the original, for the developement of a new cultus, modifying and changing details to suit its own views, the presumption becomes strong that the real sacrifice belonged to the Sañhitá, and the Bráhmaṇa divested it of its hideousness and cruelty, and made it emblematic, even as the Vaishṇavas have, within the last five or six hundred years, replaced the sacrifice of goats and buffaloes to Chaṇḍiká by that of pumpkins and sugarcane.

Nor is the Purushamedha the only sacrifice at which human sacrifices were ordained. The Áśvamedha, or horse sacrifice, required the immolation of a human being just as much as the former, and hence it is that the horse sacrifice was prohibited in the Kali Yuga along with it. The Taittiríya Bráhmaṇa of the Black Yajur Veda gives the following story on the subject: "Prajápati, having created all living beings, through affection entered within them. But afterwards he could not get out of them. He said, 'Whoever will extricate me from this confinement will become wealthy.' The Devas performed an Áśvamedha and thereby extricated him; thus they became wealthy. Whoever performs an Áśvamedha attains profusion of wealth by extricating Prajapati."*

* प्रजापतिः प्रजाः सृष्ट्वा प्रेणानुप्राविशत् । ताभ्यः पुनः सम्भवितुं नाशक्नोत् । सोऽब्रवीत् । ऋद्धुवदित्सः । यो मेतः पुनः सम्भरदिति । तन्देवा अश्वमेधेनैव सम्भरन् । ततो वै त आर्धुवन् । योऽश्वमेधेन यजते । प्रजापतिमेव सम्भरन् ऋद्धोति ।

The object of this story is to point out the necessity of slaughtering one hundred and eighty animals of different kinds at this sacrifice to liberate Prajapati from his confinement, and the first victim ordained is a man. "He (the institutor of the sacrifice) immolates a man; (the form of) a man is (like that of) Virát, the type of the animated creation. By the immolation of the man is Virát immolated. Now Virát is food, and therefore through Virát food is obtained."* The horse, the cow, the goat and other animals are ordained to be immolated in almost the same words; everywhere using the verb *álabhate*. The details of the Ásvamedha would require more space than what I can spare here, so I must reserve them for a separate paper.

Apart from the Purushamedha and the Ásvamedha, the Śatapatha Bráhmaṇa, in adverting to the offering of animal sacrifice generally, and enumerating separately the horse, the cow, the goat, &c., has a verse which is remarkable for the manner in which a human victim is therein referred to. It says "Let a fire-offering be made with the head of a man. The offering is the rite itself (*yajña*); therefore does it make a man a part of the sacrificial animals; and hence it is that among animals man is included as a sacrifice. Whoever offers an oblation with the head, to him the head gives vigour."† The commentator explains that by the term *purusha śírśa* "man's head", a man is understood, a part being, by a figure of speech, taken as equivalent to the whole.

Passing from the Bráhmaṇas to the Itihásas, we have ample evidence to show that the rite of Purushamedha was not unknown to their authors. The Institutes of Manu affords the same evidence, but it would seem that when it came into currency, the rite was looked upon with horror, and so it was prohibited as unfit to be performed in the present age. The Puráṇas followed the Institutes, and the prohibition included along with it the Ásvamedha, suicide by drowning one's self in the sea, procreation of children on an elder brother's widow, and a variety of other reprehensible and odious rites, ceremonies and customs,‡ showing clearly that the rite originally was not so innocent as the supposition of its being emblematic would make it; for had the offering been limited to the mere repetition of a few mantras

* पुरुषमालभते । वैराजो वै पुरुषः । विराजमेवालभते । अथो अन्नं वै विराट्
अन्नमेवावरुन्ते ।

† अथ पुरुषशीर्षमभिजुहोति । आहुतिवै यज्ञः पुरुषं तत्पशूनां यज्ञियं करोति
तस्मात् पुरुष एव पशूनां यजते । यद्देवैर्नदभिजुहोति । शीर्षं सदीयं दधाति ।

‡ Beef in Ancient India, ante XLI, p. 194.

over a certain number of men, it would not have been so obnoxious to Hindu feeling as to necessitate its suppression.

But while the Puráṇas suppressed the Purushamedha, they afford abundant indications of another rite requiring the immolation of a human victim having come into vogue. This was *Narabali*, or human sacrifice to the goddess Chámundá, or Chaṇḍiká,—a dark, fierce, sanguinary divinity, who is represented in the most awful forms, not unoften dressed in human palms, garlanded with a string of human skulls, holding a skull by the hair in one hand, and an uplifted sabre in the other, and having her person stained with patches of human gore. European orientalists assign a very modern date to the Puráṇas, and also to the Tantras which describe the cultus of this divinity; but poems and dramatic works dating from eight to fifteen hundred years ago refer to her and her predilection for human sacrifices, and lithic representations of her form of early mediæval ages are still extant. It has also been proved by unquestionable evidence that most of the leading Tantras of the Hindus were translated into Tibetan from the seventh to the ninth century of the Christian era, and thereby the worship of that goddess naturalised on the other side of the Himálaya.* It must follow that the Hindu Tantras existed for some time before the 7th century, and then the rite of *Narabali* was known and practised by the people of this country. How long before that period the rite was known, I shall not attempt to determine, for data for such a determination are not available; but the theory of interpolation apart, the goddess is mentioned in the Rámáyana as reigning in the nether regions; and her type, as I have already stated, is to be found in Artymis, and even among Assyrian records, and she cannot, therefore, reasonably be taken to be so modern as is generally supposed.

The Káliká Puráṇa is in ecstasy on the merits of the disgusting rite. It says, "By a human sacrifice attended by the forms laid down, Deví remains gratified for a thousand years, and by a sacrifice of three men one hundred thousand years. By human flesh the goddess Kámákhyá's consort Bhairava, who assumes my shape, remains pleased for three thousand years. Blood consecrated, immediately becomes ambrosia, and since the head and flesh are gratifying, therefore should the head and flesh be offered at the worship of the goddess. The wise should also add the flesh free from hair, among food offerings."† The Puráṇa then enters into minute details about the ways

* Csoma de Körösi, in the Asiatic Researches, (XX, pp. 569 ff.) gives a long list of Buddhist Tantras.

† नरेण बलिना देवि सहस्रं परिवत्सरान् ।
विधिदत्तेन चाप्नोति तदग्निं लक्षं त्रिभिर्नरैः ॥
नारेणैवाथ मांसेन त्रिसहस्राणि च वत्सरान् ।
तदग्निं प्राप्नोति कामाख्याभैरवो मम रूपधृक् ॥

in which, the times when, and the places where, the rite should be celebrated ; but as the whole of the chapter in which the details occur, has been already published,* I shall confine myself here to a short extract from another chapter to give an idea of the ceremony connected with the Durgá Pújá.

After describing the ritual of the Durgá Pújá, that Purána continues—“Next should be performed such sacrifice as is gratifying to the Deví. The elephant-headed (Gañeśa) should be gratified with sweetmeats ; Hari with clarified butter, (*Habis*, the word may be rendered into rice, fruits, &c.) ; the all-destroying Hara, with the threefold entertainment, (of dancing, singing and music) ; but the worshipper should always gratify Chandiká with animal sacrifice. Birds, tortoises, crocodiles, hogs, goats, buffaloes, guanos, porcupines, and the nine kinds of deer, yaks, black antelopes, crows, lions, fishes, the blood of one's own body, and camels are the sacrificial animals. In the absence of these sometimes horses and elephants. Goats, sarabha, (a young elephant, or a fabulous animal with eight legs,) and human beings in the order in which they are named, are respectively called *Bali*, (sacrifice) *Mahábali*, (the great sacrifice,) and *Atibali* (highest sacrifice). Having placed the victim before the goddess, the worshipper should adore her by offering flowers, sandal paste, and bark, frequently repeating the mantra appropriate for sacrifice. Then, facing the north and placing the victim so as to face the East, he should look backward and repeat this mantra : ‘O man, through my good fortune thou hast appeared as a victim ; therefore I salute thee ; thou multiform, and of the form of a victim. Thou, by gratifying Chandiká destroyeth all evil incidents to the giver. Thou, a victim, who appeareth as a sacrifice meet for the Vaishnaví, havest my salutations. Victims were created by the self-born himself for sacrificial rites ; I shall slaughter thee to-day, and slaughter at a sacrifice is no murder.’—Then meditating on that human-formed victim a flower should be thrown on the top of its head with the mantra ‘Om, Aiñ, Hriñ, Sriñ’. Then, thinking of one's own wishes, and referring to the goddess, water should be sprinkled on the victim. Thereafter, the sword should be consecrated with the mantra, ‘O sword, thou art the tongue of Chandiká, and bestower of the region of the gods, Om, Aiñ, Hriñ, Sriñ. Black, and holding the trident, (thou art) like the last dreadful night of creation ; born fierce, of bloody eyes and mouth, wear-

मन्त्रपूतं शोणितन्तु पीयूषं जायते सदा ।

मस्तकञ्चापि तस्यापि मांसमिष्टमिदं यतः ॥

तस्मात् तत्पूजने दद्याद् बलेः शीर्षञ्च शोणितं ।

भोज्ये निर्लाममांसानि नियुञ्जीयाद् विचक्षणः

इति कालिकापुराणे बलिनिर्णयाख्ये सप्तषष्ठितमोऽध्यायः ॥

* Blacquire, Asiatic Researches, vol. V. pp. 371 ff.

ing a blood-red garland, and equally sanguinary unguents (on thy person), arrayed in blood-red garment, and holding a noose, master of a family, drinking blood, and munching heaps of flesh, thou art *Asi*, (that which eats away the head of its victim); thou art *Viśasana*, (the drier up of its victim); thou art *Khadga*, (that which tears up); thou art *Tikshnadhára* (keen-edged); thou art *Durásada*, (the giver of difficultly attainable objects); thou art *Srígárbha* (the womb of prosperity); thou art *Vijaya* (victory); thou art *Dharmapála*, (protector of the faith); salutations be to thee. 'The sword' having been thus consecrated, should be taken up while repeating the mantra 'AÑ HÚÑ PHAT,' and the excellent victim slaughtered with it. Thereafter, carefully sprinkling on the blood of the victim, water, rock-salt, honey, aromatics, and flowers, it should be placed before the goddess, and the skull also with a lamp burning over it should be placed before her with the mantra, 'Om, Aiñ, Hriñ, Sriñ, Kausiki, thou art gratified with the blood.' Thus having completed the sacrifice, the worshipper attains rich reward."*

* श्रीभगवानुवाच । बलिदानं ततः पश्चात् कुर्याद्देव्याः प्रमोदकं ।

मोदकैर्गजवक्त्रञ्च हविषा तोषयेद्वरिं ॥

तौर्यत्रिकैश्च नियमैः शङ्करं तोषयेद्वरं ।

चण्डिकां बलिदानेन तोषयेत् साधकः सदा ॥

पक्षिणः कच्छपग्राहा वराहाश्चागलास्तथा ।

महिषो गोधिका शालस्तथा नवविधा सृगाः ॥

चामरः कृष्णसारश्च यमः पञ्चाननस्तथा ।

मत्स्याः स्वगात्ररुधिरं चोद्भृका बलयो मताः ॥

अभावे च तथैवैषां कदाचिद्वयहस्तिनौ ।

कागलः सरभश्चैव नरश्चैव यथाक्रमात् ॥

बलिर्महाबलिरतिबलयः परिकीर्त्तिताः ।

स्थापयित्वा बलिन्तत्र पुष्पचन्दनवल्कलैः ॥

पूजयेत् साधको देवीं बलिमन्त्रैर्मुहुर्मुहुः ।

उत्तराभिमुखो भूत्वा बलिं पूर्वमुखस्तथा ॥

निरीक्ष्य साधकः पश्चादिमं मन्त्रमुदीरयेत् ।

नरस्त्वं बलिरूपेण मम भाग्यादुपस्थितः ।

प्रणमामि ततः सर्वरूपिणं बलिरूपिणं ॥

चण्डिकाप्रीतिदानेन दातुरापद्विनाशिने ।

वैष्णवीबलिरूपाय बले तुभ्यं नमोऽस्तु ते ॥

यज्ञार्थे बलयः सृष्टाः स्वयमेव स्वयम्भुवा ।

अतस्त्वां घातयाम्यद्य तस्माद् यज्ञे बधोऽबधः ॥

It is not necessary for me to swell the bulk of this paper, already more swollen than what I at first intended to make it, by collecting notes of all the places where, and the occasions when, the rite of Narabali was performed, in order to show how widespread was the practice during the middle ages and modern times. Ward has given several instances of its occurrence in Bengal in his elaborate dissertation on the Hindus. The fact is well known that for a long time the rite was common all over Hindustan; and persons are not wanting who suspect that there are still nooks and corners in India where human victims are occasionally slaughtered for the gratification of the Deví. In old families which belong to the sect of the Vámácháris and whose ancestors formerly offered human victims at the Durgá and the Kálí pújás, a practice still obtains of sacrificing an effigy, in lieu of a living man. The effigy, a foot long, is made of dried milk (*khíra*), and sacrificed according to the formula laid down in the Kálíká Purána, the only addition being a few mantras designed typically to vivify the image. A friend of mine, Bábu Hemchunder Ker, Deputy Magistrate of Twenty-four Pergunnahs and author of an excellent work on the culture of Jute in Bengal, informs me

ॐ ऐं ह्रीं श्रीं इति मन्त्रेण तं बलिं नररूपिणं ।
 चिन्तयित्वा न्यसेत् पुष्पं मूर्द्धि तस्य च भैरव ॥
 ततो देवीं समुद्दिश्य काममुद्दिश्य चात्मनः ।
 अभिषिच्य बलिं पश्चात् करवालं प्रपूजयेत् ॥
 रसना त्वं चण्डिकायाः सुरलोकप्रसाधकः ।
 ॐ ऐं ह्रीं ह्रीं खड्गेति मन्त्रेण खड्गं प्रपूजयेत् ।
 कृष्णं पिनाकपाणिञ्च कालरात्रिस्वरूपिणं ।
 उग्रं रक्तास्यनयनं रक्तमाल्यानुलेपनं ॥
 रक्ताम्बरधरञ्चैव पाशहस्तं कुटुम्बिनं ।
 पिबमानञ्च रुधिरं भुञ्जानं क्रव्यसंहतिं ॥
 असिर्विशसनः खड्गस्त्रीक्षणधारो दुरासदः ।
 श्रीगर्भो विजयस्यैव धर्मपाल नमोऽस्तु ते ॥
 पूजयित्वा ततः खड्गं त्र्यं ऊं फडिति मन्त्रकैः ।
 गृहीत्वा विमलं खड्गं वेदयेद् बलिमुत्तमं ॥
 ततो बलीनां रुधिरं तोयैः सैन्धवतत्फलैः ।
 मधुभिर्गन्धपुष्पैश्च अधिवास्य प्रयत्नतः ॥
 ॐ ऐं ह्रीं श्रीं कौशिकीति रुधिराप्यायितासि ते ।
 स्थाने नियोजयेद्रक्तं शिरस्य सप्रदीपकं ॥
 एवं दत्त्वा बलिं पूर्णं फलं प्राप्नोति साधकः ॥

that in the eastern districts of Bengal this sacrifice is frequently performed, but the image, instead of being slaughtered by a single individual, is cut up simultaneously by all the grown-up members of the family, either with separate knives, or with a single knife jointly held by all. This is known by the name of *Satrubali* or “sacrifice of an enemy.” The sacrifice, both in the case of Nara- and the *Satru-bali*, is performed secretly, generally at midnight. The *Satrubali*, however, is a distinct rite, apart from the *Narabali* of the *Káliká Purána*, and authority for it occurs in the *Vrihanníla Tantra*, in which it is said, after performing certain other rites therein described, “a king should sacrifice his enemy (in an effigy) made with dried milk (*khíra*). He should slaughter it himself, looking at it with a fiery glance, striking deep, and dividing it into two with a single stroke. This should be done after infusing life into it by the rite of *Prána-pritishthá*, and repeating the name of the person to be destroyed. O consort of *Maheśa*, he doubtless destroys thereby his enemies.”*

The offering of one’s own blood to the goddess, to which reference has been made above in the extract from the *Káliká Purána*, is a mediæval and modern rite. It is made by women, and there is scarcely a respectable house in all Bengal, the mistress of which has not, at one time or other, shed her blood, under the notion of satisfying the goddess by the operation. Whenever her husband or a son is dangerously ill, a vow is made that on the recovery of the patient, the goddess would be regaled with human blood, and on the first *Durgá Pújá* following, or at the temple at *Kálighát*, or at some other sacred fane, the lady performs certain ceremonies, and then bares her breast in the presence of the goddess, and with a nail-cutter (*naruna*) draws a few drops of blood from between her busts, and offers them to the divinity. The last time I saw the ceremony was six years ago, when my late revered parent, tottering with age, made the offering for my recovery from a dangerous and long-protracted attack of pleurisy. Whatever may be thought of it by persons brought up under a creed different from that of the Indo-Aryans, I cannot recall to memory the fact without feeling the deepest emotion for the boundless affection which prompted it.

Of human sacrifices among the non-Aryan tribes of India, it is not my intention to make any mention here, so I bring this paper to a

* ततः शत्रुबलिं राजा दद्यात् चीरेण निर्मितं ।
 स्वयं विन्द्यात् क्रोधदृष्ट्या प्रहारजनकेन च ॥
 कोपेन बध्नादेवि सत्यं सत्यं महेश्वरि ।
 प्राणप्रतिष्ठां कृत्वा वै शत्रुनाम्ना महेश्वरि ।
 शत्रुक्षयो महेशानि भवत्येव न संशयः ॥

close by adding the following summary of the conclusions which may be fairly drawn from the facts cited above:

1st. That, looking to the history of human civilization and the rituals of the Hindus, there is nothing to justify the belief that in ancient times the Hindus were incapable of sacrificing human beings to their gods.

2nd. That the S'unahsépha hymns of the Rik Sañhitá most probably refer to a human sacrifice.

3rd. That the Aitareya Bráhmana refers to an actual and not a typical human sacrifice.

4th. That the Purushamedha originally required the actual sacrifice of men.

5th. That the S'atapatha Bráhmana sanctions human sacrifice in some cases, but makes the Purushamedha emblematic.

6th. That the Taittiríya Bráhmana enjoins the sacrifice of a man at the Horse sacrifice.

7th. That the Puráṇas recognise human sacrifices to Chaṇḍiká, but prohibit the Purushamedha rite.

8th. That the Tantras enjoin human sacrifices to Chaṇḍiká, and require that when human victims are not available, an effigy of a human being should be sacrificed to her.

